

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

---

NO. XCVII.—JULY, 1859.

---

## ARTICLE I.—LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF CLASSIFY- ING MAN.\*

THE natural history of man is one of the most important, as well as one of the most difficult, departments of modern science. The number, variety and complexity of the questions involved, render it requisite to weigh with great care all the classes of facts which enter into their solution. The tendency in this, as in most new lines of inquiry, has been, to draw positive conclusions from narrow and inadequate inductions. The field of investigation being as broad as man and his manifold relations, nothing which touches either, can be safely excluded from examination by those who assume to lay down authoritative conclusions in ethnological science.

One class of inquirers have taken for granted that man is an animal, and nothing more, and that he is to be described, classified and affiliated, on precisely the same principles with the turtle or the alligator. Another class have ignored the animal nature of man almost entirely, and directed their attention exclusively to the phenomena of his moral and intellectual nature. It is natural that both these classes of writers should fail to give solidity and trustworthiness to their results. He who undertakes to settle any great question of

---

\* Contributions to the Natural History of the United States of America. By Louis Agassiz, vol. i. chap. i., section xvii.

Sketch of the Natural Provinces of the Animal World and their Relations to the Different Types of Man. By Louis Agassiz.

[Contributed to Nott and Gliddon's Types of Mankind.]

ethnology without a comprehensive survey and careful scrutiny of all the elements, physical and mental, which mark likeness or diversity among men, whether taken in the mass or in detail, will fall short of meeting the demands of a truly scientific method.

It is a remarkable fact, that while naturalists have studied with care the manifestations of instinct and intelligence in animals, as a means of determining specific similarities and differences, they have quite uniformly undervalued the more marked and similar phenomena in man. The evil consequences of such failure can only be estimated from an examination of recent ethnological treatises, written by naturalists who assume that whatever is true of man, is true of every animal, and that the differences noted between them are in degree only, and not in kind. The part which the mind of man plays in his constitution and history, should be the measure of the attention which should be given to mental phenomena, in all attempts to affiliate and classify him. Language is the most important of these mental phenomena, and deserves special attention from the place which it holds as the endowment which especially distinguishes man. By a figurative use of the term language, many writers have endeavored to include under it those rude means of expressing emotion which are common to all animals, and have confounded these with the articulation of man. Having assumed that there is no radical difference between man and animals in respect to language, they easily reach the farther conclusion, that the similarities of voice existing between allied species of animals, are precisely analogous to the similarities between articulate languages belonging to a common stock, and hence, that no affinity of blood can, under any circumstances, be inferred from the fact, that widely separate tribes of men speak the same or a similar language. The generally low estimate which naturalists, of the class to which we have alluded, put upon language as a basis for the classification of men, is expressed with great distinctness by Professor Agassiz in the paper which he contributed to Nott and Gliddon's *Types of Mankind*, and in the first volume of his con-



tributions to the Natural History of the United States. Similar ideas are repeated in papers which he has elsewhere printed. Hence we are justified in considering them as his matured convictions, and as representing the views of a class of scientific men to which the distinguished author belongs.

We propose to examine the principles contained in these statements, with reference to forming a judgment of the real value of comparative philology as a help for studying the natural history of man, and also with a view of suggesting the proper limitations and cautions with which it should be used. Such an examination will incidentally illustrate the true method of the science of ethnology, and the enormous breadth of the induction requisite for the settlement of any one of the many questions which the science involves.

On page 72 of Nott and Gliddon's work, Professor A. writes as follows :

"The evidence adduced from the affinities of the languages of different nations in favor of a community of origin, *is of no value*, when we know that among vociferous animals, every species has its peculiar intonations, and that the different species of the same family produce sound as closely allied, and forming as natural combinations, as the so called Indo-European languages compared with one another. Nobody, for instance, would suppose that because the different species of thrushes inhabiting different parts of the world bear the closest affinity to one another, these birds must have all had a common origin ; and yet with reference to man, philologists still look upon the affinities of languages as affording direct evidence of such community of origin among the races, although they have already discovered the most essential differences in the very structure of these languages."

On page 65, of contributions to the Natural History of the United States, in Note (1) the author says :

"I cannot therefore agree with those authors who would disconnect mankind from the animal kingdom, and establish a distinct kingdom for man alone. \* \* \* \* \* A close study of the dog might satisfy every one of the similarity of his impulses with those of man, and those impulses are regulated in a manner which discloses physical faculties in every respect of the same kind as those of man. \* \* \* \* \* And though all these faculties do not make a philosopher of him, they certainly place him, in that respect, upon a level with a considerable proportion of poor humanity.

"There is a vast field open for investigation \* \* \* \* in the relationship between the cycle of intonations which different species of animals of the same family are capable of uttering, which, as far as I have been able to trace them, stand to one another in the same relations as the different so-called families of languages."

In these extracts there are asserted or directly implied, three propositions :

(1.) That the "physical faculties" of animals (dogs, for example) "are in every respect the same kind as those of man," and are also in degree "upon a level with a considerable proportion" of the human race.

(2.) That the different families of human languages (the Indo-European for example) "stand to one another in the same relations" and form the same "natural combinations" as do the notes of birds and the cries of animals of allied species, and that the similarities and coincidences between these notes and cries are in all respects the same in character with those pointed out by philologists as connecting the languages of men with each other.

(3.) That when two distant tribes speak a language similar or the same, the fact is of "no value" as indicating "community of origin," and furnishes no presumption of affinity of blood.

These several propositions imply the truth of each other. We propose to make a few remarks bearing upon them, without taking care always to specify the special point to which our criticisms may apply. We would also exclude from the discussion all special reference to the distinction between the human and animal faculties, beyond what may arise from the examination of the single topic of language. The remarkable assumptions of the great naturalist on the faculties of animals are well calculated to challenge the boldest contradiction. The issue is somewhat skilfully covered by representing the object of the writer to be not the degradation of the faculties of man, but the elevation of those of animals. Had the labors of Professor Agassiz proved the existence of new and hitherto undiscovered faculties in dogs or horses, vindicating

their claims to a new moral and intellectual position, his affirmation of the specific similarity of these faculties with those of man, would not necessarily have been degrading to the human species. But he makes no claim to any such new discoveries. He leaves the faculties of animals just where naturalists, from the time of Aristotle, have placed them. The new doctrine, consequently, does not elevate the animal *absolutely at all*; it only degrades man to his level. If animals are actually on "a level with a considerable proportion of poor humanity," then they have a moral nature, and have rights, and are entitled to a government of law, and horse-breakers are kidnappers, and butchers are murderers. If this conclusion be denounced as absurd, then it follows that the "considerable proportion of poor humanity" referred to as "upon a level" with animals, have also no rights which an educated man is bound to respect, and they may be treated with as little consideration as the experimental anatomist bestows upon the dogs and rabbits whom he puts to the torture, and murders by inches in the interests of science.

We would not for a moment harbor the idea that the great anatomist, whose genial nature and scientific enthusiasm are so contagious and delightful, and whose recognition of final causes is so emphatic and reverent, [would be prepared to accept distinctly either horn] of the dilemma in which his theory seems to place him. His position gives us one more illustration of the inadequate conceptions which a truly great naturalist may form and utter when he travels out of the range of his special studies. Resisting the temptation to continue a discussion so attractive and important, we pass to the consideration of the analogies between the language of men and animals.

The complex system of signs made use of by man as the instrument of his thinking and the means for communicating his ideas and emotions, is susceptible of a classification into what may, with sufficient accuracy for our present purpose, be denominated as signs of emotion and signs of ideas. The one is reflective, articulate, consequent upon thought, involving, even in its most elementary forms, abstraction, generali-

zation and judgment, and highly conventional in its structure. The other is spontaneous, unreflective, and mainly indicative of the elementary emotions pertaining to the animal nature. It communicates knowledge to others only by indicating the existence of certain distinct feelings. It is not acquired, but is instinctive in its origin, universally understood, common to all men, and excepting the expression of the "human face divine," and with certain limitations in respect to distinctness and force, is shared by man with the higher orders of the animal kingdom. This instinctive or spontaneous expression we recognize in the interjections extorted by surprise, terror, or woe—in the tear, the smile, the groan, in gestures expressing the natural impulses and passions of man as an animal. It is not conventional, hence its common name "natural language." Like the similar phenomena among animals of the same species, it never changes; hence its test, universal intelligibility. This mode of expression can, within certain narrow limits, be improved by the action of human will and intelligence, but its essential character cannot be changed, even when the mind of man, in the case of himself or animals, is applied to its development. These natural signs of emotion and intelligence in animals may become more distinct by a process of training, but this cannot be carried beyond a certain narrow limit, for the character of these signs is determined specifically by the form of the animal's material organization. The conventional signs of articulate speech are capable, from their very nature, of indefinite variation and development. The flexibility of the human organs adapts them to the modifications of expression demanded by the infinite changes in human thought and emotion. In the instinctive signs of emotion possible to animals, the relation between the sign and the thing signified is fixed and unchangeable, leaving almost no capacity for modifying this relation by thought or association. The combinations of elementary sounds, of which the human voice is capable, receive their significance almost entirely from association, and they may be increased or varied in form or the associated meaning, to any extent by the will of those who use them. Even the most general ex-



amination of the laws, conditions and uses of articulate human speech makes it impossible to confound it, either in kind or degree, with those vague and imperfect signs of emotion permitted to the animal kingdom.

In looking a little more into the details of this distinction, it is, perhaps, requisite to notice those words in articulate speech in which the sound and sense are suggestive of each other. The words of this class seem to have mainly occupied the minds of those who have seriously attempted to reduce the emotional cries and notes of the brute creation to the same law with the language of man. Though words of this class have given rise to much fanciful speculation, they are, in fact, of little real importance in reference to the question before us. From the nature of words whose sound represents the sense, it will be seen that they must be confined to those signs which distinguish the phenomena of a single sense—that of hearing. Even within this narrow range, they are confined to the coarser and more obvious distinctions among sounds. The more delicate sounds, those which enter into the composition of music and the utterance of cultivated minds, obstinately refuse to be represented by this rude and coarse expedient. Indeed, nearly all the finer varieties of intonation are marked by the figurative use of the names appropriated to the *silent* sensations.

We represent music or speech, as smooth, sweet, gliding, high or low, heavy or light, sharp or flat, far oftener than by words which imitate the sounds we describe. Though the number of words whose origin may be attributed to onomatopœia is in many languages considerable, yet the moment they pass into common use, they become figurative, and all relation between the sound and the sense practically vanishes. Besides, if this law presided to any considerable extent over the formation of languages, we should expect to find similar sounds represented by similar imitative words, in languages generally. The number of terms, all varying in form and sound, which in many tongues are applied to the same object, proves that naming is too free a process to be limited by the law of the punster. The Laplander is said to have thirty

different words to represent the reindeer. In the old Saxon there were said to be fifteen to designate the sea. In the Arabic we are told that the lion has five hundred different names, the serpent two hundred, the sword a thousand, honey more than eighty. Von Hammer informs us that Arab writers have given the camel the enormous number of five thousand seven hundred and forty-four.\*

Though words of the class under consideration are found to a limited extent in all languages, it is evident that the vast majority of those originally onomato-poetic have lost that character by figurative use. When we compare any series of allied, or even unallied, languages with each other, the number of words which owe their origin to this source, and are found actually similar or the same in sound and meaning, is surprisingly small. After excluding all words evidently developed by the relation of the organ of sound to the instinctive emotions, such as interjections and those in which the sound actually represents the sense, we shall find that the vast majority of words in all languages are purely arbitrary combinations of the elements of human speech, and that the reason why they represent one idea rather than another is conventional, and depends upon the volition of those who use them. When we say this, we do not deny that law presides over the development of language as well as over all intellectual or moral processes. But it is a law of liberty, not a law of necessity. Though some sort of resemblance or analogy may be the link which unites sound and thought, any one of a thousand may be selected, and no intellect can determine beforehand what the selection will be. Articulation, the basis of all the varieties of human expression, is denied to nearly all animals by their organization. They are necessitated by the form of their organs to a very few combinations and changes of sound. Man, with an unlimited power of combining and arranging sounds, can choose any one of them as a name for a given thought. Laying aside all discussion concerning its origin, it is admitted by all, that language, as made use of

---

\* See *Origine du Language*, par Ernest Resian, p. 142.

by man, is the free conscious utterance of thought. Let a small body of men be furnished with the elementary conception of speech, it is evident that the variety of forms which it may possibly assume in the course of ages, is limited only by the number of combinations of those elementary sounds of which the vocal organs are capable. Taking the letters of the alphabet in a given language as roughly representing the elements of speech, it is evident that the names which could be constructed by the possible permutations of those letters, making syllables, with each other, and by those possible syllables, with each other in turn, would be practically beyond computation. When we bear in mind that these syllables and words may be varied in the same language by accent or tone, we increase the naming power of an alphabet in proportion to the number of accents, more or less of which the words, by the genius of the language, are capable. It is worthy of remark, also, that the flexibility of the connections between thoughts and things on the one hand, and language on the other, is illustrated by the fact, that one object or idea may be indicated by the names of its several relations to those who speak or hear. A savage may name a horse, for example, by means of any one of its relations to himself; he may be named from the number of his legs, the form of his feet, the swiftness of his movement, the food which he prefers, from the peculiarities of his head, ears, or tail. On the other hand one word may, by figurative use or juxtaposition, come to represent a large number of distinct and even entirely different ideas. The Anglo-Saxon word *hleo*, shelter, is the original of the syllable *lee*, in the compound *lee-shore*. The *lee* side of a ship is the sheltered side, but a *lee-shore* is that upon which the wind directly blows. The same word is made to represent two ideas directly opposed to each other, from the relation or point of view being opposite. To the seaman on board his ship, the sheltered side of the vessel is the *lee* side, while the shore relatively to his place of observation, though lashed by the tempest, is the *lee-shore*. The Greek augur looking out for omens faced the north, while the Roman, for a similar purpose, faced the south. Hence

the left hand of the Greek was in the west, while that of the Roman was in the east. Thus, while both looked toward the east for auspicious omens, they denoted them by names of diametrically opposite import. These illustrations, from a paper read before the London Philological Society, by the late Mr. Garnett, might be indefinitely extended. In fact, most words are names of relations, rather than things. Any one of the numerous relations of an object or idea to the percipient subject, may be selected as its temporary or permanent representative, and one word may be made to indicate a similar relation of a great number of things or ideas to the mind.

A moment's reflection upon this view of human language, will show how far it stands removed from the rigid organic laws which control and limit, by a physical necessity, the languages so-called, of the highest orders of animals.

Words being to so great an extent names of relations, it follows that all naming by means of language, involves processes of abstraction, generalization, and judgment. Human knowledge consists in the apprehension of a relation between objects and the conscious mind. No other knowledge is possible to a finite being. All specific knowledge as distinguished from what is received vaguely and in the mass, comes by separation of the parts from the whole, in order that the part may receive specific attention. This is abstraction, and it involves the affirmation of similarity or difference. Our process of naming connotes our mental processes, in thus differentiating our knowledge. Still more emphatically does this principle hold in naming actions. To name an action, it is necessary to discriminate it from the vague cœnesthesis or consciousness of life which is the common source of all specific bodily movement. The act is recognised and named by virtue of its being discriminated and becoming specific. When the name is repeated to denote a similar act, it becomes at once the name of a class, and an abstract term. No sentence can be constructed expressing any form of existence, action, or passion, without the use of words which are generated in, and through, abstraction and generalization. The very idea of language as an organic



product, involves these mental processes, incarnated in the words, as the soul in the body, as the form in the matter. No matter how rude the organism, no matter how barren of ideas, how narrow in vocabulary a language may be, the principles we have stated hold universally true. The relation of the thought-process in any proper sense of the term, and language, is one of reciprocal necessity. Language is requisite to any considerable evolution of mind. Without it man remains intellectually in an abnormal condition, analogous to that which anatomists denote by the phrase "arrest of development." The testimony of teachers of deaf mutes, and of the most careful observers of psychological phenomena, is singularly uniform upon this point.

We have lying before us a series of extracts from more than forty different authors, expressing themselves to this general effect, comprising men of the highest reputation, of all schools of philosophy and of various nations. Among them are the names of Leibnitz, Bossuet, Reid, Stewart, and Cousin, as psychologists; William Von Humboldt and Frederic Schlegel, as philologists; Sicard and De Gerando, as writers on the instruction of deaf mutes, and Cuvier as a naturalist.

While it is affirmed that these high mental acts are involved in the giving of names to objects, and in the construction of the most simple sentences, we do not overlook the fact that all primitive or uncultivated tongues are predominatingly sensuous in their character. But no language can by any possibility remain sensuous when used in the construction and utterance of human thought. Just in the proportion that a language is used, will it become abstract, throw off its sensuous character, and become the conventional and arbitrary representative of ideas which association and usage have linked to its words.

The prevalence of abstract terms in a language is a test of the intellectual training of those who speak or write it. We are told that there are tongues of savage tribes entirely deficient in such terms. But the very instances given in proof teach the contrary doctrine.

Whatever may be our opinions concerning the internal mental action of animals, all must admit that we have no proof of their possessing those capacities of abstraction, generalization, and judgment, which enter of necessity into the mechanism of the rudest and barrenest human articulate language. Animal language, however liberally interpreted, gives us nothing analogous to the abstract terms requisite to fix and register a single concept in human reason. The terms *tree*, *boat*, *father*, *mother*, *in*, *through*, *by*, *live*, *act*, involve capacities which no animals, however endowed, have been able to indicate by any power of expression which the Creator has given them. Whatever we may *imagine* their thoughts to be, they have no means of connoting and recording them for the use of others. Judging from the absolute necessity of articulate signs or their equivalents for human thinking, and assuming that their mental movements must follow the analogies of the human mind, we are driven to the conclusion that their means of expression form an accurate measure of the grade of their intelligence. If this be so, how broad and trenchant are the lines which separate the highest order of animal intelligence from the average capacity of the lowest tribes of man. Every naturalist knows that in the animal kingdom there is a uniform and beautiful adjustment of organism to power, whether it be of intelligence or instinct. So uniform is this relation that it takes the character of a law. The absence in any family of animals of the organ for the action or manifestation of any power, furnishes a strong presumption against the existence of the power itself. The presence of canine teeth in an animal indicates the hunting and carnivorous instinct. The webbed foot in a bird is a proof that its proclivities will lead it to the water. If the stomach of an unknown animal were found to be that of a ruminant, a naturalist would confidently affirm that the animal when living had the characteristics of the herbivora. It would be contrary to all the analogies of nature to suppose the existence of capacities of thought in animals equal to those of man, or nearly so, while the all-wise Creator has denied to them the only organism by which they could be exercised, developed, or their re-

sults made manifest. The mechanical imitative power of articulation in some birds is merely an apparent exception to this general law, and would seem designed to illustrate the fact that, though the capacity for speech is requisite to the exercise of intelligence, it has no power to create it. The empty, unexpressive utterance of a parrot, is enough to illustrate the difference between speech as a mechanical effect and the language of a self-conscious, reasonable soul. We remember having once heard a parrot utter alternately a string of blasphemous oaths and the Christian Doxology in a hideous caricature of the melody of Old Hundred. The broad chasm between the utterance of a human soul and that of an animal would hardly have been more impressively shown. When we bear in mind that the symbols of the algebraist in its wonderful complexity, the diagrams of the geometer, the rhythm of the poet, the notation of the musician, and the nomenclature of the sciences, are all involved in the idea of artificial language, it increases indefinitely our idea of the elevation of man's faculties in degree and kind above all we can conceive possible to the brute creation.

Another point in which the language system of men and animals specifically differ, is in the capacity for modification, development, and acquisition. Apart from the definite agency of man, there is no improvement, change, or development in the utterance of the brute creation. Limited to a narrow range of variation by a physical necessity, it is confined to the manifestation of instinctive emotion, and that low grade of intelligence possible in the absence of abstract ideas. It remains the same in all normal conditions of life. Human language develops with human intelligence. The analytic process by which we can show the possibility of the formation of the agglutinated and the assimilated composite forms of speech, from an aggregation of monosyllabic roots, if it does not give an absolute proof of the great law of linguistic development, shows the power of man's intellect to operate the most enormous changes in the instrument which it uses. Within the range of the great linguistic families, we have absolute historical evidence of these changes having been actually

produced. We can detect their law, their rate of movement, and predict, with a good degree of certainty, what will take place in the future.

So constant is the agency of this modifying power, that the words of every language become a sort of self-registering barometer, marking the constant flux and reflux in the tides of a people's intellectual atmosphere. A few centuries are often sufficient to make documents unintelligible to the lineal descendants of those who wrote them. Where a language is unfixed by literature, and the people who speak it are few, and have been isolated from the tribe to which they belong, a single generation produces a perceptible result, and a century makes their tongue unintelligible to those from whom they were severed. Illustrations of this principle are found among our western Indians, the Mongolian tribes, and the Bushmen of South Africa. Nothing really analogous to this remarkable law of linguistic development takes place in the expression of animals. It continues the same from age to age, modified only by those slow physical changes which result from climate, food, domestication, or exposure. In addition to this capacity for developing a vernacular in the process of time, man has capacity to acquire new languages to an extent limited only by the wonderful powers of a Mezzofanti. A Hottentot child will, in a short time, forget his click, and speak good English or French. The imitations of sounds by the mocking-bird cannot be thought analogous to the power of acquiring a new language in man; for there is no proof that the sounds, when imitated, such as the call of the hen to its young, or of other birds to their mates, are understood by the mocker, and consciously used as representative of the particular instinctive emotion which generates the sound imitated. When he imitates the watch dog, barking at an intruder upon his master's premises, there is no evidence that he knows its instinctive import; he evidently imitates the empty, unmeaning sound, just as the next moment he mocks the creaking of a passing wheelbarrow. For the expression of its instincts, desires, and fears, it has its own native note. A bird trainer may, by constant drill with a bird-organ, cause the canary, if kept apart



from its own kind, to repeat a few notes of the instrument, but the painful imitation is finished by the utterance of the note native to its organization. But the capacity for spontaneous and varied combinations of musical sounds, springing from conceptions within, is denied him. Its power of changing his note is imitative, not genetic. It is no ability for conscious thought which uses the physical organs, under the influence of a controlling purpose, intelligently conceived.

We have hinted, already, that the analytic processes of comparative philology have traced the formation of the conjugational and case endings in the polysyllabic languages so completely, that a strong presumption has been created that they have gradually been formed by the aggregation and synthesis of monosyllabic roots. So strong is this presumption, that this theory of the development of grammatical and syllabic forms has been, with great unanimity, adopted by all the profoundest philologists of modern times. So far as actual history enables us to go back, we everywhere find evidence of flux and change. Languages are mixed, modified, and disintegrated. Looking back, over the existing species and fossil remains of human speech, we find upheavals, abrasions, and subsidences similar to those which task the power of the physical geologist in reproducing, in thought, the appearances and conditions, and connecting the formations of past geological eras. The Paleontology of human speech reveals a past of incessant change and variation. With the revelations of the fossil period, that of actual history coincides. The comparative philologist then expects to find variety and change in the past and the present. Differences in languages are accounted for; he seeks, also, a reason for coincidences and similarities.

If two tribes of men were found, one north of the Caspian, the other in the heart of Austria, who spoke one or two words in common, especially if these peoples were different in their grade of culture, religion, and social customs, we should be very likely to attribute the result to accident. If we were to find a dozen or twenty such words, it would excite our wonder. If we were to find many hundreds of such similar words, and these the names of the commonest and most indis-

pensable objects, such as are requisite in every household, the presumption against their having been all separately hit upon by chance would be overwhelming. We define the nature of the words to be selected for comparison, for upon this, to a certain extent, the ethnological value of such coincidences depend. Words relating to commerce, art or science, would have less value than those simple every-day terms which form the staple of every language, which are learned in childhood, and which experience shows are never laid aside but with an entire change of a nation's vernacular. Hence ethnologists, by common consent, have selected as the basis of comparison among rude dialects, special lists of words, excluding from them all likely to have been readily imported, and leaving only such as *must* be found in the families of all human beings. When we find the Hebrews using a word to designate the peacock, which is of Tamil origin, and find this bird spoken of as an importation of foreign commerce, the presumption naturally is that some kind of commercial intercourse existed between the Hebrews and the Malabar coast. The coincidence of a considerable number of such terms would be of less ethnological value than a very few such words as *sun, moon, water, fire, earth, son, daughter, father, mother, child*, these being terms least likely to have come into common use by any other means than the occupancy of a common territory or household in some former period.

In addition to simple words, which are names of things or actions, we have, in most languages, contrivances to indicate or name the relations between words, or rather between the ideas which they represent. We say in most languages, for in those which are monosyllabic these relations are indicated by clumsy and inadequate means, such as juxtaposition of important words and the use of distinct and sensibly significant terms approximately and roughly naming the relation which it is desirable to indicate. Of this the Chinese gives the special example. In other tongues, the words naming relations are joined, or, in the phrase of the philologist, agglutinated to the term whose meaning, relatively to the others in the sentence, requires to be pointed out, but in such a way

that the original significance of each added part may be clearly seen. Of this class the Mongolian and American languages furnish examples. In other languages still, these added particles have become more or less completely assimilated to the root words, so that to the casual observer, even one to whom the language may be vernacular, the addition and the root appear to be but one term. Of this partial or complete assimilation the Semitic and Indo-European tongues are examples. These additions, when thus assimilated, are called case and conjugational endings. These contrivances, whatever they are, constitute the most essential and characteristic part of the physiology of speech. They are equally significant with the separate root words, and are far more tenacious of life. When we find two widely separate tribes, in addition to a considerable portion of the same vocabulary, using similar artificial contrivances to mark the relations of time, place, distance, contiguity, volition, obligation, doubt, or command, we have a new and independent element of comparison. A fundamental similarity in these respects gives us a presumption in favor of the hypothesis that this similarity has arisen from original and intimate contact of these tribes, stronger even than that furnished by the likeness of their vocabularies. When we find similar root words, and also similar grammatical forms, extending through the most important parts of two languages, we have an argument drawn from the concurrence of these separate and independent lines of proof which is of overwhelming force in support of the hypothesis that these tribes or their ancestors have been at some time dwellers of the same territory and members of the same family. The natural explanation of such a coincidence is original blood relationship. So strong and obvious is this presumption that he who denies it assumes the burden of proof, and must furnish the most positive evidence in order to set it aside.

In view of the considerations which have been presented, we are justified in the conclusion, that so far as language gives us the means of forming an opinion, there is no foundation for the opinion that the "psychical faculties" of ani-

mals "are in every respect of the same kind as those of man," nor that in degree they are on a level with a "considerable proportion" of the human race. We are justified, also, in concluding that the analogy assumed to exist between the language of men and that of animals breaks down on examination, in every vital point and in every essential particular. We are justified, also, in the further conclusion, that language, so far from being of "no value," is one of the most important aids to the ethnological student, and cannot be neglected by any investigator of the natural history of man who would expect his conclusions to bear the testing process of a sound scientific method.

If we mistake not, this last statement may be made still more clear by inquiring how far ethnological inquiries have actually been facilitated and made definite by philological investigations. By so doing we shall prepare the way for some statement of the special tests and limitations requisite to render these investigations available for the completest scientific results. The history of comparative philology and its applications would require an article in itself. We forbear entering upon a field so attractive, contenting ourselves with a few explanatory facts. It is a science of modern times. The study of the original languages of the Old Testament in the sixteenth century, and the necessity that was felt for the light which could be thrown on the Hebrew from the study of its cognate tongues, laid the foundation for the ultimate comparison of the Semitic family of languages. The obvious similarities between the Latin and Greek, and between them both and the languages of modern Europe, could not fail to attract the attention of scholars. Curious and ill-regulated speculations concerning the language of our first parents, and a patriotic desire on the part of scholars to vindicate the claim of their several vernaculars to the honor of having been spoken in the garden of Eden, accumulated materials, which, though barren of immediate results, became subsequently useful in the light of a more scientific method and a broader induction. The Hebrew, Chinese, Celtic, Basque, Abyssinian, Syriac, and even the Low Dutch, severally



found their advocates for the honor of having been the primitive tongue of the human race. These speculations, founded on a wrong idea and pursued by a false method, ended in confusion, and drew upon etymological inquiries a ridicule like that which was bestowed so liberally upon the early chemists and geologists. The great mind of Bacon seized the idea of a philosophy of language founded on induction, and set it forth partially in his "*De Augmentis*," but the pregnant conception was not immediately fruitful. In 1710, Leibnitz issued a memoir on the value of language as a means of tracing the origin of nations. He is doubtless entitled, by his labors, to the high praise given him by Bunsen of being the founder of the "comparative philosophy of language, and the first successful classifier of languages then known."\* The investigations of Sir William Jones into the languages, ancient and modern, of Hindostan, and that of Anquetil Duperron into the language of the Zendavesta, with the publication of the "*Mithridates*" of Adelung and the essay of Frederic Schlegel on the "*Language and Philosophy of the Hindoos*," gave an impulse to comparative philology which has revolutionized all previous methods and theories concerning language, and made it a department of positive science, with laws as definite and results as trustworthy as geology, chemistry, or zoology. The intense enthusiasm of its votaries, and the enormous accumulation of its facts and the brilliancy of its results, have given it an importance which no investigator of the past history of man can safely or honestly ignore. No man is an adequate teacher of our own, or any of the ancient or modern languages, who is willing to remain ignorant of the methods and general results of this department of learning. So rapid has been its progress, that no inconsiderable amount of reading is requisite to keep up with the results of each year's investigations, even by one already familiar with the terminology, methods, and history of the science.

Early investigators of the Hebrew language established its

---

\* Bunsen's *Phil. Univ. Hist.*, vol. i., p. 44.

close affinity with the Arabic and Aramæan tongues. For this, Scripture history had already prepared them, but of its general outlying affinities little was known, and the family of men to which their immediate eastern neighbors and enemies, the Assyrians and Babylonians, belonged, was entirely unsettled. No phenomena of form or color could be ascertained from the monuments then known, sufficiently definite to solve the difficulty. Reinhold, Forster and Schloezer adopted the notion that they were non-Semitic barbarians from the north, and spoke Slavic. Michaelis, in his commentaries, calls the Chaldeans, Scythians. Lersbach held that the Chaldeans were Kurds from the mountains of Kurdistan, and spoke a dialect of Persian, and were identical with the Carduchi of Xenophon. Even Gesenius inclined to this theory.\* But the deciphering of the trilingual arrow-head inscription at Behistun has disclosed the language which they spoke, and proved it to have been unquestionably Semitic, and not Iranian. It is shown by Bunsen to furnish the example of a Semitic tongue, earlier, or less developed in its form system, than the varieties of the class preserved in any other monuments. Hereafter no ethnologist will think of adopting any other classification of these peoples than that indicated by the language, especially as it coincides so fully with the scattered hints given in the Hebrew Scriptures and elsewhere, of the affinities of the Assyrian and Babylonian population. This inscription illustrates the fact that the Medes and Persians spoke the same language, and that they controlled as subjects a Semitic and also a Tartar population. The arrow-head alphabet was adjusted to the expression of ideas in Persian, Semitic and Tartar, thus revealing the affinities of the three great elements of the population of the Persian empire, at the time the inscription was made.†

Another Semitic dialect, by many supposed to have been the most common language in use in Palestine at the Christian era, is the Aramæan or Syriac. This was supposed to be extinct as a spoken language until within a few years; it having

---

\* See account of opinions, Pritchard's *Phys. Hist. Man*, vol. iv., p. 563.

† See Sir Henry Rawlinson's several papers, in the *Royal Asiatic Journal*.

been replaced in Syria by the Arabic, brought in by the Saracen conquest. Carsten Niebuhr reported in his travels, the existence of some Syrian villages near Mosul, but it drew little attention from scholars. The Missionaries of the American Board have since discovered large communities of these descendants of the ancient Syrian Christians who had adopted the views of the Nestorians, still speaking a Syriac tongue, allied to that in which the ancient version of the New Testament called the *Peschito* was written. They occupy the mountainous districts of Kurdistan, on the upper Tigris, and are perfectly distinct from the Kurds in whose vicinity they live, in both manners and language. The whole surface of ancient Syria is dotted over with philological evidence, in names of natural objects and political divisions of territory, indicating, even in the absence of history, that an Aramæan-speaking population had once occupied the territory. By the means of the evidence of language, we are able to identify a specimen of the ancient Syriac stock as it existed before the Saracen conquest, and also to form an estimate of the powerful impression which the Saracen invasion made upon them, both in respect to blood and ideas. We can, by this living language, connect the past population with the present time, and determine the family of men who formerly occupied and gave names to the Syrian territory. It is an illustration of the rarity of the instances in which a language, having been once spoken in a territory, becomes entirely extinct, or fails to leave traces of its former hold. It seems perfectly certain that language alone could have given the clue to unravel the complications of Persian, Babylonian, and Syrian ethnology.

Irish antiquarians have shown an anxiety to derive the Celtic families from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, influenced perhaps by a desire to give some sort of historical authority to the Irish mythical chronicles.

In 1676, an opinion was advanced by Sammes, that the first colonizers of Ireland were merchants from Tyre and Sidon. This was adopted by other Irish antiquaries, and finally was considered settled by a professed discovery, by General Vallancey, that the lines of Phœnician put into the

mouth of a Carthaginian interlocutor, in the *Penulus* of *Plautus*, were Irish Gaelic, and that by consequence the Phœnician origin of the Irish was proved. The passage in question had long ago been shown, by *Bochart* and *Joseph Scaliger*, to be very nearly pure Hebrew. In this view *Gesenius* coincides, dismissing with sharp grammatical ridicule what he calls the "*somnia*" of the Irish antiquaries. The great work of *Gesenius*, on Phœnician inscriptions, settles forever the Semitic and non-Celtic affiliations of those energetic colonists, who, like the English in India, took possession of North Africa, Spain, and the Balearic Islands, and contended almost successfully for the possession of Europe with the rising power of Rome. The Sidonian inscription, recently unearthed in Asia Minor, lends its evidence in confirmation of the same philological and ethnological result. Late linguistic researches have shown that the native tribes whom the Carthaginians subjected or mingled with for trade, spoke a language which shows affinity with the Semitic class, and furnishes a singular analogy to the relation which the English now sustain to the speakers of adulterated Sanscrit in Hindostan. The great Atlantic or Berber stock has, by means of philology, been presumptively affiliated, in all its numerous tribes, extending from the valley of Egypt to the Canary Islands, and from the Mediterranean south of the equator, with the Syro-Arabian stock. To such an extent has the Semitic element been found in African tongues, that some inquirers, fully acquainted with the results of the latest research, are disposed to look upon the Semitic tribes in Asia as an outlying fragment of a great African family.\* It is worthy of remark that the Guanches of the Canaries, who became extinct about 1494, have been satisfactorily identified with the Berber family, by means of a vocabulary of their words which has been preserved. The recent African traveller, *Dr. Barth*, has traced the *Tawarek* languages continuously far south of the Great Desert, and into the midst of the true African tribes. Although physical

---

\* See *Dr. Beke*, in *Proceedings of Lon. Phil. Soc.*, vol. ii., p. 91; also *Latham's Report on African Ethnology to Brit. Association*.



variations, quite broad and marked, manifest themselves in the Berber tribes, no satisfactory physical reason has yet been given for separating the white dwellers in Mons Aurasius from the very dark inhabitants of the oasis of Wadreag, in the Great Desert.\* Since the sixth century, the existence of numerous inscriptions on the rocks surrounding the roads leading to Mount Sinai have been known to the learned. They were in an alphabet unlike that of the Arabic of the Koran, and for a long time were unintelligible. The character was discovered by Edward Beer, of Leipzig, in 1843. The language is found to be Arabic in its foundation, but somewhat unlike that of the Mohammedan literature. It was found to be remarkably allied to the Gheez of Abyssinia. Its alphabet, though reducible to the Phœnician type, is not that of the Koran, but similar to that of the old Ethiopic version of the Scriptures. This alphabet was supposed to have been the work of Frumentius, the missionary who translated the Scriptures into the Gheez. It now appears to have been the old Himaryatic character, constructed while the Arabs were pagans, and giving us presumptive evidence of very early communication between Southern Arabia and Africa. From the Gheez to the proper Kaffir tongues of the south and interior of Africa, intermediate languages, like the Agow and Galla, shade off by imperceptible gradations, suggesting an affinity more radical and ancient between the people of the two continents, than can be accounted for by any partial migrations of the Himaryatic Arabs to Africa, or of the Abyssinians to Arabia. Every new advance in African philology of late years, indicates more and more clearly the importance of this connection, which the relations of language between the two continents first pointed out with any considerable degree of clearness. We pass by the new line of ethnological investigation opened by the proved affinity of the great Kaffir class of tongues extending across the whole southern portion of the African continent, and the partial indications of its relation to the Abyssinian tongues north

---

\* See F. Newman on Berber Languages, Prichard Phys. Res., vol. iv., p. 617.

of the equator, as too complicated and too imperfect in its completed details for our present purpose.\*

The term Indo-European has become a common in literature. It originated from a remarkable affinity which has gradually been shown to exist between the principal languages spoken from the banks of the Ganges to Iceland. It may now be considered as a settled question in science that the Aryan, Slavonian, German, Celtic, Greek, and Latin languages are, in fact, offshoots from a single original family of tongues. The evidence of this general fact is so clear to any one who examines it, that we deem Max Müller justified in saying that "the proof of the original unity of language and stock among the Indo-European nations is sufficient to produce conviction in the minds of a common English jury." Yet so lately have these conclusions been arrived at, that so competent a scholar as Dugald Stewart, as late as 1827, occupied pages in attempting to prove that the analogies between the Sanscrit, and Greek, and Latin, could be accounted for by the supposition that the former tongue was a jargon formed by the priests from the two latter languages, after the manner of "kitchen" Latin and macaronic verses.† The knowledge he supposes was obtained by the intercourse of the Eastern priests with the Greek kingdom of Bactria. Our space will only permit us to allude to some of the ethnological results which have sprung from this linguistic discovery. No inquirer into mere somatic phenomena would ever have dreamed of classing the fair-skinned German, or Slave of the north, with the black Hindoo of Calcutta. But so great has been the accumulation of facts, from language, all tending in the same direction, that, in spite of physical differences numerous and strongly marked, no ethnologist can deny that a close affinity of some sort existed between these tribes in the past, without establishing a skeptical method which would overthrow all scientific evidence. When we ex-

---

\* See F. Newman on the Galla verb, *Proceedings of the Lon. Phil. Soc.*, vol. iii.

† See Stewart's *Works* Hamilton's edition, vol. iv., p. 78.

tend our comparison to antiquities and mythology the weight of evidence becomes absolutely overwhelming.\*

We now allude to a few instances within the range of this great class, illustrating the general point before us. The school-boy's Cæsar tells him that all Gaul is divided into three parts, occupied respectively by the Aquitani, Celti, and Belgæ. It tells him in another place that the Belgæ were Germans, and the general idea of scholars, until the beginning of the present century, was that the Aquitani or Basques, south of the Garonne, though speaking a special dialect, were a part of the great Celtic stock. This was the opinion of the celebrated Edward Llyud, and it was from him quite extensively adopted. Although a grammar of the Enskara was published in Mexico in 1607, and another by the Jesuit Larramendi in 1729, yet little was known of the language by scholars until the publication of the "Mithridates," by Adelung. This at once showed the language to be unrelated to any of the European tongues, except by some remote grammatical analogies to the Finnic, Hungarian, and American languages. Subsequent analysis of the local geographical names of Spain revealed to W. Von Humboldt the identity of the Euskara and the ancient Iberian tongue, and gave evidence of original occupancy by the Basques of a large part of the Spanish Peninsula, and also unmistakable traces of an extension of the stock into the adjacent countries in the south of Europe. Early ethnological investigators met with insuperable difficulties in admitting the correctness of Cæsar's designation of the Belgæ as Germans. The Belgic language of Gaul, whatever it was, had been superseded by the Latin and French, and it had left no literature. The Belgæ of Britain were clearly Celtic. In this dilemma Pritchard made a minute analysis of all the old geographical names of the region, connecting them with the people by the personal appellatives preserved by the ancient historians and geographers, and especially by Cæsar. The result was unmistakable evidence that the body of the Belgæ, with the exception of some intrusive German tribes, must have been Celtic, speaking

---

\* See Max Müller's "Comparative Mythology," Cam. "Essays."

a language, probably, varying from the other portions of Celtic Gaul, as Welsh varies from Gaelic.

Although the Gauls laid aside their mother tongue with a facility which, perhaps, finds no parallel in history, and adopted the Latin, we find throughout their territory fragments of their ancient speech similar to those which identified the Belgæ of Cæsar with their Celtic neighbors. Among the inhabitants of Lower Brittany we find still extant a Celtic language with a considerable amount of popular literature, collections of which have been made by Villemarque. This illustrates the tenacity of language, even in the country most commonly cited as an example of the unreliable nature of philological marks in classifying tribes of men. The slight influence of Norse and German elements in the language of France is explained by the fact that the Germans came into Gaul as conquerors, few in numbers and without a literature. The best authorities estimate the army of Clovis as low as six thousand men. Other and separate German tribes spread themselves gradually among a people possessing already a rich literature, fixed organization, and the assimilating force of Christianity. The Franks spoke the Tudesque for a time among themselves, but becoming Christians and being compelled, like the Normans in England, to use the language of the majority, they left but a partial deposit of their vocabulary in the French tongue. This deposit, however, is largely traceable in personal names, political distinctions and provincial dialects. That portion of Gaul which was really German in the time of Cæsar, the watershed facing the Lower Rhine, is German still in blood and to a great extent in language. The Normans came to Neustria with a Scandinavian speech, but they were sea robbers and few in number, and of necessity intermarried with the Gallo-Roman population, among whom they settled by treaty, rather than by conquest. The channel islands are Norse, the names of towns and families are, to some extent, Norse. William the Bastard understood Norse. The language was spoken at Bayeux some time after Hastings. The philology of Normandy, when it shall be minutely explored, will undoubtedly reveal more fragments of the dialect of these early filibusters than we at present are aware of. Here,



as almost everywhere, the majority ruled in the matter of languages, and the children spoke what they heard from their mothers.

The great work of M. De Chevaillet, "*Origine et Formation de la Langue Française*," just completed, adds immensely to the estimate hitherto made of the amount of Celtic and Gothic elements in the French language. This learned and elaborate work proves that in taking on the Latin language, in its earlier or later forms, the Celts and Germans have left a large deposit of their words in the new formation, and that these fossil remains of the tongues supposed to be extinct would enable us, even in the absence of history, to connect the modern French with the fierce and patriotic antagonists of Cæsar, and the barbarous Franks who gave their name to the magnificent domain of Charlemagne, St. Louis, and Napoleon.

The Celtic has ceased to be spoken in England proper, and the fact is often cited as a proof of the failure of language to mark blood. But when we examine the family and geographical names of England, we find constant evidence of the past and present existence of a Celtic element.

The German incursions were from the east, and the Celtic blood and names regularly increase as we go westward. We find remnants of the ancient language just where history and deduction would lead us to expect the most of ancient blood. Moreover, the class of common words retained in the Celtic is just such as we should expect to be introduced by those occupying the position of a conquered people. The list of Celtic words in modern English which are not common to the Indo-European languages, collected by Garnett, refer almost entirely to servile occupations. In Cornwall the English has overcome the Cornish within the last hundred years, but Cornish words are spread over the whole district and population of Cornwall. Even the common distich regarding names,

*"Tre, Val, and Pen,*  
Mark the names of the Cornish men,"

is a proof of the fact.

The Celtic race was considered to stand apart from the whole body of the Indo-European stock until the publication of Dr. Pritchard's *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations*, which was announced in 1813, but not published till several years after. This gave a new impulse to Celtic ethnography, which has been followed up by Bopp, Pictet, and Meyer, with such success, that the affiliation of the aborigines of France and the British Islands with the great Aryan family, is almost universally admitted. The only substantial question still at issue is the period at which the Celts broke off from the common stock. That there is a connection all admit. Even their mythology is so clearly Aryan that Lappenberg has, with good reason, called the Druids the "Brahmins of the North." It is found, however, that the relation of the Celtic to the general Aryan family is by no means so close as that of the other members to each other. Their geographical position points out an earlier migration westward than can be affirmed of any other members of the family. Minute examination of Celtic philology accords remarkably with this supposition. Though a certain amount of affinity between the families in question is clearly proved, it is only by extending the limits of the Indo-European family that the Celtic can be included within it. The Celtic languages seem to be a transition stock between the agglutinated and the syllabic tongues proper. As compared with the other members of the class, it is represented to have, among others, the following peculiarities:

1. Its declension of nouns is exceedingly scanty. In the Irish alone there is found a form for the dative plural in *aibhcos*=foot, *cos-aibh*=*pedibus*. "Beyond this," says Latham, "there is nothing else whatever in the way of case" as found in the other tongues of the class. Even "this isolated form in question is not found in Welsh and Breton."

2. The Celtic differs from the Indo-European class, in the agglutinate character of its verbal inflections.

In Welsh the pronouns *we*, *ye*, *they*, are "*ni*," *chwyi*, and *hwynt*. The root for love, is *car*. As conjugated in the plural it appears as follows:

Car—*wu* = am—*amus*.

Car—*ych* = am—*atis*.

Car—*ant* = am—*ant*.

The pronouns thus added, and forming the conjugation, are distinctly seen to be real, separate words, agglutinated, but not assimilated to the root. While this process can be traced in the more fully developed languages of the class, it can only be made clear by laborious grammatical analysis. In this we find an inflection in the process of formation, indicating that the language, and the race speaking it, broke off from the mother stock before the full development of the inflexional system had been completed.\*

3. It differs by the system of initial mutations. The system of transmutation of initial consonants, which, says Dr. Charles Meyer, is "the peculiarity of the Celtic, by which that language is distinguished from all others." We have seen that the Celtic tongues are deficient in case endings. This deficiency is made up by a change in the initial letter of the noun, according to its relation to other words in a sentence. These changes follow according to a certain law, in which the euphonic and grammatical changes seem, to a certain extent, to coalesce with each other and form one consolidated system.†

We have given these illustrations of the Celtic grammatical system, to show with what completeness both the similarities and differences, between the Celtic and other members of the Indo-European family of tongues, coincide with the actual facts of history and geography. Traces of a deposit of Celtic speech which are found in Germany, Spain, and Northern Italy, show that, historically, it antedated other tongues in the occupancy of Western Europe, as much as the partial development of its inflectional system shows it to have preceded them in the time of its divulsion from the parent stock.

An hypothesis, suggested originally by Arndt, but identified with the name of Rask, who first fully developed

---

\* Latham Eng. Lang. Ed. 3d, p. 78.

† See also Le Gouidec, Grammaire Celto-Bretonne, p. 13.

it, deserves a passing notice in this connection. It was found that certain fragmentary peoples were scattered over Europe, whose languages could not be classified with any existing European tongues. These are the Lapps, Fins, Esthonians, Basques, and Skipetar or Albanians. The three first-named peoples, though differing physically to a considerable extent, were found to agree so entirely in their language, that they are considered ethnologically one stock. Taking this as a hint, Rask developed the idea that a body of people disconnected in stock and language from the Indo-European families were the aboriginal inhabitants of Europe, and that possibly these discontinuous areas or islands of speech were the outcropping peaks of a primitive linguistic and tribal formation. This pregnant philological hint has led the way, in a series of investigations, into the contents of ancient barrows and burial-places, resulting in a critical classification of weapons of war, utensils, and skulls, in the light and under the guidance of this single idea. The labors of Castren and others have connected the Finnic race with the inhabitants of northern Siberia. Gyarmarthy had long before this pointed out the affinities between the Finnish and the Madjar languages. Subsequent investigation has affiliated the Hungarian with the speech of the Vougouls and Ostiacks north of the Caspian sea. Students of the Basque have not, so far as we know, shown an affinity between it and the Finnish, beyond a remarkable similarity in its grammatical structure, which, like that of the American languages, is highly agglutinate or polysynthetic. The Skipetar have been probably identified with the ancient Epirotes, but their language, supposed by some to be Indo-European, still waits for its permanent classification. Whatever may be the ultimate fate of the Finnic hypothesis, it has given an impulse and direction to ethnological inquiry, in all its departments, which has already wrought out most brilliant results. Set forth and illustrated by a philologist, whose genius has rarely if ever been surpassed, it may justly be claimed as a practical contribution of philology to ethnological science.

We have already exceeded the limits proper for an article,



and have not alluded to the results of linguistic research in unravelling the complications of the ethnology of Hindostan, by separating the whole Tamil population from the Aryan tribes, evidently intrusive from the north. Nor have we referred to what we may hope in the future, in the affiliations of the barbarous hill tribes of the aborigines of India with each other, and through a series of linguistic islands extending around the north of the Bay of Bengal, with the transgangetic population of Burmah and Siam, and even with the tribes of Thibet amid the eastern spurs of the Himmalayas and the roving hordes of the high, cold plains of the central table-land of Asia. We have not spoken of the Malagasi, connected closely with Africa by location, but affiliated by language with the Malay population, three thousand miles across the Indian ocean. We have not been able to allude even to the continent of America, where the coincidences of sound philology, in the hands of Gallatin and Duponceau and their successors, have reduced the multitudinous tongues of the North American tribes to three great classes, different in vocables, but agreeing in grammatical development, and revealing even the law and the natural causes of their diversity in roots. We trust that sufficient proofs have been given to beget the conviction in a scientific mind, that comparative philology, so far from being of "*no value*" in ethnological classification, holds, in fact, a relation to inquiries into the physical history of man, similar to that which palæontological studies sustain to physical geology.

We had prepared a series of propositions founded in part on the preceding illustrations, and in part on facts not here introduced, giving the appropriate cautions and limitations in the use of philological inquiries in ethnology. We had designed to illustrate the manner in which the different lines of inquiry in ethnological study mutually correct and modify each other and should be made to give their concurrent testimony before any of the great questions of the science can be settled. But this design, if ever completed, must be laid aside for a future occasion.

## ARTICLE II.—THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE DISCOURSES OF JESUS.

BY D. GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER.

IN the following examination we select but a single point from the comprehensive question of the relation of the two Testaments to each other. We do not, for example, consider how the apostles, as individuals or as a class, treated the old Covenant and the writings of the Old Testament; nor do we consider the position which the Evangelists, as thoughtful and independent historians, assumed toward the Old Testament, and in particular toward the prophecies, to whose fulfilment in the life of Jesus they now and then refer; but we direct our attention solely to the Redeemer, that we may ascertain His view of the Old Testament and listen to His divine word, thus obeying the command of God the Father: "*Hear ye Him!*"\* To examine this point seems to us desirable; and the more so, because, unless we are mistaken, it has never yet been made the topic of a distinct and connected investigation. We seek at least in vain for such an investigation in writings where we might soonest expect to find it. Works on the "Life of Jesus," systems of "Christian Doctrine" and "Biblical Theology," treatises on the "Christology of the Old Testament," etc., touch upon this subject in a very occasional and fragmentary manner; the same is also true of exegetical works. *Stier*, to be sure, published in 1828 an Essay, which is, to some extent, parallel with our investigation; but it does not go into detail so fully as to render a new examination superfluous.

Whoever attempts to study all the discourses of Jesus in the Gospels, observing with special care their references to the Old

---

\* Matt. xvii., 5.

Testament, will certainly receive a strong impression, not merely of the frequency but also of the force with which He alludes to the "Scripture," and of the many ways and circumstances in which He employs the word of the Old Testament. And if we enter now upon a closer investigation, two things must be carefully distinguished; viz., *what* Jesus drew from the Old Testament and regarded as Scripture, and *how* He used this material.

We first inquire: What does Jesus have in mind when He quotes "the Scripture?" In particular, it has been often asked, whether Jesus used and quoted the *apocryphal* writings of the Old Testament, or only the canonical books. A very important and valuable basis for the study of this point is furnished by one part of the Essay by *Stier* on "The Apocrypha in the New Testament."\* We refer to his large collection of (102) passages from the Apocrypha, arranged according to the succession of books, and accompanied in parallel columns by those passages of the New Testament which may be regarded as having been directly quoted from the former, or somewhat moulded by them. *Stier's* own opinion is, that at least *some* intentional allusions to apocryphal passages are not to be denied. *Bleek* pronounces a dozen of these sufficiently important to be recognized as imitations. Yet while it is conceded that no formal citation is to be found, but only at most reminiscences of apocryphal passages, or silent allusions to them, he supposes that merely a certain probability can be reached in the matter. *Kerl* on the other hand has observed, in his "Apocrypha of the Old Testament" (s. 116), that here and there, where an actual reference seems to be made, the expression should be connected with a canonical rather than an apocryphal passage. Matt. xxiii. 38., e g., may be traced as well, or even better, to 1 K. ix. 7, Jer. vii. 14, *sq.*, as to Tobit xiv. 4, *sq.* Moreover, *Stier* and *Bleek* often assume dependence on particular apocryphal sentences, when the meaning in the New Testament is so entirely different from that in the Apocrypha that an actual allusion to the latter is highly im-

---

\* In seinen Andeutungen für gläubiges Schriftverstandniss, II., 486-524.

probable ; e. g. Matt. vii. 11, *sq.*, where that which Baruch affirms of the children of Jerusalem is promised, if there is any dependence on the Apocrypha in the language of Christ, to the heathen. All things considered, it does not seem to us probable that an apocryphal sentence floated occasionally before the mind of Jesus, although if such were the case it would be no more surprising than the fact that He sometimes connected His discourse with current proverbs or with Rabbinic expressions.

The case would be different with such passages as John vii. 38 and Luke xi. 49, if it were made out that Jesus quotes in them from *lost* apocryphal or canonical books. But as to the former passage, the conjecture of *Semler*, *Paulus*, *Bleek*, that a Jewish writing since lost may have contained the words as there quoted, is not sufficiently justified ; for the circumstance that the language is not to be found verbally in the Old Testament is no sufficient reason for resorting to such a conjecture. We prefer to assume, with *Bengel*, *Lücke*, *De Wette*, and *Stier*, that Jesus here “pronounces in words accommodated to the present time” what is figuratively said in some passages of the Old Testament ; e. g. in Isa. lviii. 11, and Zech. xiv. 8. And as to Luke xi. 49, *sq.*, instead of the hypothesis of *Morus*, *Paulus*, *Van Hengel*, *Ewald*, and *Bleek*, that the quotation existed at that time in a book now lost, we prefer the interpretation which supposes that Jesus, conscious of His divine nature, presents His prophecy as the words of the wisdom of God, in such a way indeed, that He does not expressly denominate Himself personally, “the wisdom of God,” but “speaks in the style of an old prophecy” (*von Gerlach*), and points but indirectly to Himself. The latter passage, moreover, with its parallel, Matt. xxiii. 35, gives evidence (v. 51) that Jesus had the same Old Testament canon as we, and especially that no other book was contained in it ; for here, it is evident, He has in view the first canonical book and the last, Genesis and the Second of Chronicles ; for in the latter, ch. xxiv. 20, *sq.*, is related the murder of Zechariah, which Jesus mentions as the last murder, while He names that of Abel as the first.

This accords with the well-known manner in which Jesus



divides and names the books of the Old Testament or "the Scripture;" for He either comprehends all under "the Law" and "the Prophets" (Matt. v. 17, xi. 13; Lu. xxiv. 27), or with more accuracy distinguishes the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Lu. xxiv. 44), which not only agrees with the old classification תורה, נביאים, and כותבים, but also indicates that the Psalms were already the first book in the third part, as Chronicles, according to Matt. xxiii. 25, was the last. Hence Jesus, when quoting and using "the Scripture," had in view the canon of the Old Testament, the whole canon as we now possess it, and nothing besides this canon; and if He ever alluded to passages of our Apocrypha, this, it is manifest, was never done in such a way as properly to cite them or place them on a level with "the Scripture."\*

It has also been asked whether Jesus did not use certain parts of the canon by way of preference; and in particular it has been supposed that He had a special predilection for the prophets. *Gieseler* has proposed the conjecture in his Church History (I., i., 77-78, 4th Germ. ed.) that reading the prophets of the Old Testament had awakened in the kindred spirit of Jesus a religious feeling, and "His labors were accordingly directed to the end of reviving once more the prophetic element of the Mosaic religion." If by this language he means to intimate that Jesus referred to and employed the remaining books less frequently than the prophets, the evangelical records will not justify his language; for the Saviour appeals to the law as well as to the prophets; he quotes with evident pleasure from the Psalms, and not unfrequently from the historical books of the Old Testament. But we cannot in such a case as this decide mechanically and by measure; we find rather that the

---

\*Says *Lücke*, in his note on John vii. 3-9: "That the words here cited are not to be found exactly anywhere in the Old Testament, is no sufficient reason for regarding the book from which they are taken as apocryphal, or as a lost canonical writing. In the New Testament ἡ γραφή always without exception denotes the Canon of the Old Testament, which contained at that time no other book than it does now. There is no trace in the discourses of Jesus of the use of apocryphal books. It certainly belonged to the didactic wisdom of our Lord to employ only the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament."

Lord was master of the whole Scripture of the old covenant, and applied the same as the peculiar property of His spirit—the law of Moses as well as the prophets, the history and the prayers of the psalter as well as the explicit word of promise.

If now we pass from a consideration of *what* Jesus used out of the Old Testament to inquire *how* He used it, we receive from a comprehensive examination of His discourses the impression of a deep inward belief and earnestness of conscience in His treatment of the Old Testament. If Jesus had only appealed to the Old Testament in discourses before the people, in interviews with the scribes, or in conversations with His disciples, it might perhaps be supposed that this belonged to His method of teaching, that He shaped His course according to the prejudices of others, and taught *κατ' ἀνθρώπων*, without for Himself holding the Old Testament in so high esteem. But He also used “that which is written” for His own consolation and strength. Moreover, it is plain from the didactic and polemical discourses in which He quotes the Old Testament, that this is done according to His own insight and belief, and not on the principle of accommodation. Far from intimating, though but indirectly, by His silence, that the Scripture has only a temporary authority, He rather reproaches His disciples for their want of understanding and of willingness of heart to believe *ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται* (Lu. xxiv. 25), that is, on the basis of all the prophecies; and by this language He represents prophecy concerning His person as an assistance and motive to faith in Him, the suffering and risen Saviour, and hence insists that it aggravates the guilt of unbelief; thus giving His disciples to understand that they were far enough as yet from estimating the Old Testament as highly as they ought. And if the thought, expressed by *Reinhard*\* and *Planck*† ever seeks admission into the mind, that Jesus did not appeal to the Old Testament with the full earnestness of personal conviction, His open testimony respecting Himself in Matt. v. 17, *sq.*, should suffice to repel the

---

\* Plan Jesu, s. 15 ff.

† Gesch. des Christenthums in der Periode seiner Einführung, I., s. 175 ff.

thought or eradicate the prejudice. For in this fundamental passage, where Jesus makes known His attitude toward the Old Testament, He opposes at the outset, most emphatically, the opinion that He was aiming to overthrow the old covenant, or enfeeble and set aside the Old Testament, by the negative words, "Think not that I am come to destroy—καταλῦσαι—the law or the prophets." This opinion, which might have arisen from painful solicitude as well as from hostile suspicion, Jesus roundly rejects as false, and confronts it with the positive truth, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil"—ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι. Doubtless πληρῶσαι as well as καταλῦσαι is to be taken in a general sense, embracing the law and the prophets; for the conjecture of *Strauss* (*Leben Jesu*, I., 497, 1, Aufl.), that πληρῶσαι is to be understood chiefly of a fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies found in the Old Testament, is quite arbitrary and unfounded. Jesus also testifies incidentally of the Scripture in general: οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή, (Jo. x. 35), that is, it cannot, in harmony with its nature as God's word, be abolished or made null and void; and it is obvious how perfectly this λυθῆναι corresponds with the καταλῦσαι above. On the other hand, as *Tholuck* has beautifully shown, the πληρῶσαι which Jesus positively affirms of Himself is not to be understood as partial, but rather as manifold; it does not merely signify to maintain unchanged or to confirm, nor again, to complete or render perfect (the Socinians and *De Wette*), but to fulfil; that is, to teach, and observe perfectly, to realize fully; so that what had thus far been a naked command, should become actual by deed and execution, what had been hitherto a mere promise and prophecy should secure a full realization, and the whole reach its proper measure and goal. How this was effected in particular instances we shall see below. If now we add to this declaration the words of Christ, which we shall presently examine more carefully, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," we must absolutely reject the hypothesis of accommodation. *Strauss* is here perfectly right: "The strong expressions in respect to the imperishableness of the law, and in respect to the guilt of

him who should be so rash as to break its least commandment, cannot possibly be derived from mere accommodation; for to affirm the indispensableness of that which one nevertheless holds to be superfluous, and wishes by-and-by to set aside, would be acting not merely dishonestly but also unwisely."

However high a position is thus assigned to the Old Testament Scriptures, Jesus is nevertheless far from pronouncing the old covenant and the Scriptures pertaining to it absolutely perfect. He characterizes the Old Testament rather as a revelation which anticipates its own fulfilment, which has its end and object, not in itself, but beyond itself, in Christ. This lies in the *ἡλθον πληρῶσαι*, Matt. v. 17; of which Jo. v. 39, "Ye search—*ἐρευνᾶτε*—the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me," is the complement and interpretation. For our purpose it is immaterial whether *ἐρευνᾶτε* is held to be an indicative or an imperative; yet in opposition to *Stier*, but with a cloud of exegetical witnesses, e. g., *Beza*, *Vitranga*, *Bengel*, *Lücke*, we are convinced by the whole context, before and after our verse, that it *must* be indicative; for throughout the whole discourse *testimony* is given respecting the Jews, but there is nowhere a *command* requiring obedience or a word of admonition; and besides, the reproach in verse 40, which is united with verse 39 in direct linguistic and logical connection, is only then pertinent and forcible, if the searching of the Scriptures which should properly lead to Jesus is recognized as a fact, *ἐρευνᾶτε* being an indicative. Thus our Lord testifies to the Jews that they turn over the Bible and search therein; He then points out the motive which leads them to do this, namely, their opinion that they have in the Scriptures eternal life; and finally He passes judgment on this opinion: it is half error—*δοκεῖτε* in an unfavorable sense—and half truth; the truth in it, though not recognized by them, is, that the Scriptures testify of Jesus Christ: "and they are they which testify of me;" the error and superstition in that opinion is, that whoever *possesses*—*ἔχειν*—the Scriptures, possesses thereby eternal life. And many passages written in the period after the return of the



Jews from exile bear witness to the actual prevalence of this error.\* But while Jesus rejects this error, He at the same time shows the truth to which it clings, namely, that the Scriptures testify of Him and point to Him in whom eternal life is to be found. He thus reveals "the golden mean" between a superstitious reverence of the Scripture which abides by the letter and deifies it, and an improper undervaluing of the Old Testament and of the Bible in general. We find then in Jo. v. 39, a complement to the language of Matt. v. 17; for in the latter Jesus starts from Himself and defines His relation to the Old Testament, but in the former He starts from the Old Testament and discloses its relation to His person. So little will the Lord annul the law and the prophets, so far is He from undervaluing the Scripture, that He not only preserves but also fulfils the same; and yet He confesses no less decidedly that the Scripture is not itself eternal life, but a witness of Him who is and who gives that life.

We now return to Matt. v. 18: "Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." But does this really signify "that eternal duration is promised to the smallest letter of the law?" (*Strauss*, *Leben Jesu*, I., 497.) Many interpreters so understand these words; *Bleek*, however, is the first who has explicitly maintained (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1853) that *ἕως ἃν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ* was not employed to express a limit, but was spoken proverbially, signifying that the world should sooner perish than the law lose its validity. But the words we believe ought to be taken strictly, and only in case they were to give an impossible sense when thus explained could we understand them otherwise. And strictly interpreted, they affirm that a definite *terminas ad quem* is fixed, a *terminus* which is designated in a two-fold manner; first as the passing away of heaven and earth, as the

---

\* From the apocryphal books we cite only Sir., xxiv. 32, Baruch iv. 1; and from the Rabbinic teachings but one, viz., *Pirke Aboth*, II., 7, "Whoever procureth for himself the words of the law, procureth for himself life eternal." Cf. *Lange*, *Christl. Dogmatik*, II., 151 sq. Aum.

end of the present order of things ; and secondly, as the perfect realization of all which is contained in the law—"till all be fulfilled." Cf. Lu. xvi. 17, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail." As certainly as the latter passage is meant to be understood literally and earnestly, so certainly is also the former. Hence the Lord affirms that the world as it is, the present order of things, shall one day pass away ; and at the same time the law also, yet not without having previously found its perfect realization in history.

But have we not pressed the words beyond measure ? *Calvin* thinks that "some play very acutely upon the word *until* ; as if the passing away of heaven and earth, which will take place at the day of final judgment, were about to put an end to the law and the prophets." Yet he presently admits that "then assuredly, just as tongues will cease and prophecies also, so I suppose the written law with its exposition will be no more." Whether our interpretation is merely an "acute playing with a little word," may be seen by comparing Matt. xxiv. 35, with the text before us. Most interpreters assume that the two expressions are nearly identical, e. g., *Calvin*, *Olshausen*, *Stier*, *Bleek*, and others, while *Tholuck*, with whom we agree as to Matt. v. 18, alludes to Matt. xxiv. 35, but does not bring it into comparison so fully as he ought. One must examine the words : "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but *my words shall not pass away*," very superficially to assert, with *Olshausen* and *Stier*, that our Lord affirms of His own words the same which is said of the law in Matt. v., 18. Are they not essentially different statements ? Does not Jesus say in perfectly clear, unambiguous language that *His* words shall not pass away while heaven and earth do pass away ? Thus His word actually has an endless existence, while the law or the Scripture of the old covenant is to exist as long as the world stands, but is nevertheless temporal and transitory. When heaven and earth shall perish, when the new heaven and the new earth shall appear, and all things become new, then will the law also and the Scripture of the old covenant be fulfilled or realized *in* history and terminated

with the world's history, but the words of Jesus, who is the essential and eternal Word, will remain with eternal and life-giving power.

We have thus far, in a wholly general way considered *how* Jesus esteems and values the Old Testament. But there are still many questions which claim an answer; e. g., How does He understand the history of the Old Testament? How, in particular, does He regard the Mosaic law? Is His interpretation free or verbal? Does He attach himself to the traditional Jewish exposition of the Sacred Record, or rather oppose this? Does He regard the general scope of passages only, or find that which is minute important? If we examine the subject more closely, these and many similar questions demand attention. In order to answer them we will divide the Old Testament into three parts: the *Law*, or the commands and institutions of the old covenant; the *History*, or the facts and persons of the Old Testament; and finally, *Prophecy*, or the predictions of that volume. We shall therefore investigate separately the manner in which Jesus treated these elements of the Old Testament.

1. The *Law*, or the Commands and Institutions of the old Covenant. That which first attracts our notice in this respect is the obedience which Jesus renders to the law, and not merely to its directly moral, but also to its ritual claims. It is His *custom* to visit the synagogue on the Sabbath day (Lu. iv., 16 *κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτοῦ*). He journeys to the feasts at Jerusalem. He visits the temple and eats with his disciples the Paschal lamb. After healing a leper he commands him to show himself, according to the law (Lev. xiv), to the priest, and present the offering commanded (Matt. viii., 4); and he enjoins upon the ten lepers (Luke xvii. 14), who were to be cleansed on the way, to show themselves to the priests. Thus in both cases did he expressly observe the Levitical law; yet in the first with the added clause mentioned by all the synoptical Gospels: *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*, words which it would be erroneous to interpret as signifying that obedience to the Mosaic precept was designed to be only a demonstration and accommodation to the priests. A comparison of the passages where the same expres-

sion occurs (Matt. x. 18, xxiv. 14), shows that Jesus, in His command, referred to the priests chiefly for this purpose, that they might attest the reality of the leper's cure, by their official inspection and judgment, and that if, in spite of this miracle, they should maintain their unbelief in Him, they might bear witness directly against themselves. The negative design mentioned by Calvin, "And at the same time Christ took away from them all occasion for charging Him with sin, since He *omitted no point of the law*," can take but a secondary position. During His *temptation*, Jesus, in the spirit of faith and obedience, used the word of God in the law as a mighty weapon for His protection and defence, (Matt. iv.) The first temptation he smites with the truth of Deut. viii. 3; the second with the prohibition of Deut. vi. 16; the third with the chief command of the Old Testament, Deut. vi., 13, *sq.*, and always by means of His *γέγραπται, πάλιν γέγραπται*. (cf. Luke iv., 12.) Especially instructive is the course of events in the second temptation. The promise of angelic aid (Psalm xci.) was applied by the tempter as a bait; but Jesus drives him from the field by means of another word from the Bible: "Again, it is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." He opposes to a passage taken out of its connection, and therefore inapplicable, another passage which forbids intentional tempting of God, as sin. (cf. *Stier*, Redan. Jesu 1, 2.) By his course in this instance the Lord instructs us to apply the Scriptures not fragmentarily and by an arbitrary selection of particular passages, but in its connection, and especially to appropriate to ourselves the promises of God only as we obey His commands, "for we cannot," says *Calvin*, "rely upon the promises of God except as we obey his mandates," and *Bengel* remarks on this passage, "*Scriptura per Scripturam interpretanda et concilianda*."

Thus, according to His fundamental position, "for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," Matt. iii. 15, does Jesus in his own case adhere practically to the law, and the description in His Sermon on the Mount, "Whosoever shall do and teach (the commands) the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. v. 19, applies in a pre-eminent



sense to himself. Jesus appeals to the law as authority in *teaching*, when the rich young man asks Him what he must do to inherit eternal life, Matt. xix. 16. (cf. Mark x. 17; Luke xviii. 18.) For while declining the appellation, *Good Master*, He answers, first—"Keep the commandments;" and to the further question, "Which?" He replies by naming the particular ones. By means of the definite article—*τὰς ἐντολάς*—He characterizes them as well known; He cites in fact a portion of the Decalogue. But why commands of the second table only? Without doubt from educational wisdom, since He chooses those commands which lead directly to a knowledge of oneself and of sin, "By the law is the knowledge of sin," Romans iii. 20. "This he did," says *Calvin*, "because a man's disposition is most readily discovered in works of charity; piety toward God is indeed superior, but as hypocrites often feign observance of the first table, the second is better adapted to be used as a test." Bengel remarks, laconically: "*Officia secundæ tabulæ palpabiliora.*" But *Calvin* erred in supposing that the fourth command was cited after others which followed it in the Decalogue merely from a neglect of the strict order of sequence; we regard it, with *Stier*, as intentional that those commands are placed first which relate to speech and outward action, that a positive command which notices the disposition then follows, and that love to one's neighbor, which is wholly internal, finishes the series. And doubtless our Saviour's reply to the further question, "What lack I yet?" namely, "Sell all which thou hast and give to the poor," is essentially connected with this order; for it points indirectly to the first table, and gives the questioner to understand that wealth is his idol. Thus explained, the language of Christ, including the commands which are quoted in part with verbal accuracy, and in part according to their sense, forms a proper climax luminous throughout, with a high wisdom and a deep insight into the nature and design of the Decalogue; for this, in the first place, is a summary of the action necessary to procure eternal life; but in the second place, since perfect obedience is not possible in the case of sinful man, it was intended to lead us through a knowledge of sin unto Christ. (*παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστὸν*, Gal. iii. 24.)

The answer which Jesus gave to the scribe who asked Him in the name of the Pharisees, "Which is the greatest command in the law," Matt. xxii. 36, *sq.* (cf. Mark xii. 28), is akin to the foregoing. So likewise is the reply which he made to the "lawyer" who tempted him, saying, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" Luke x. 25, *sq.* In the former case the question presupposes an essential distinction in importance between the several commands; in the latter the query relates to the action generally which leads to eternal life. Here Jesus first replies by the twofold question, "*What is written in the law? How readest thou?*" That is, He will reveal nothing new in reply to the question, What must be done? But he adds to the interrogation, "What is written?" another, "How readest thou?" This latter expression is taken by most interpreters to be the usual Rabbinic formula in citing Scriptural proof; but standing as it does with the phrase, "What is written?" it can hardly be equivalent to this, and so tautological. We agree, therefore, with *Stier*, who remarks—"That which is *written* must also be *rightly read*; thus, "*How readest thou* that which is addressed to all?" *Bengel* also interprets in the same way: "It must be read not only often, but *rightly*." The scribe knows a suitable reply: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," etc., to which Jesus responds: "This do and thou shalt live," or as *Luther* interprets: "The doctrine is precious and right, but, good Sir, *do it also*. I would fain see the doer; for you have spoken it and written it, you all know it, and are in need of no other doctrine. But both you and others fail by not doing it; ye imagine it is enough to speak and think the words; but no! no man will thus live or be saved." The same command of love to God and one's neighbor which is here named by the scribe, is given by Jesus (Matt. xxii.) in answer to the lawyer who inquired of Him, which is the greatest command in the law. But we notice one peculiarity in this reply, namely, that Christ, in direct contrast with the Rabbinic custom of dividing the commands into classes, and subordinating one to another, shows their essential unity. The command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, etc. (Deut. vi.

4, sq.), is by his decision the first and great commandment, that is, not one among several, not a comparatively higher among those of the same kind, but "the command of all commands" (*Olshausen*) in so far as the law in requiring the outward act properly requires the inward disposition of the heart. The second command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," (Lev. xix. 18), is like—*ὁμοία*—the first, that is to say, similarly fundamental and comprehensive, since there can be no *actual* love to God without an exercise of it in love to one's neighbor, or *true, hearty*, and *profound* love to one's neighbor which is not rooted in love to God. Jesus closes with the declaration, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," that is, this twofold command bears the whole weight, and is the very kernel and marrow of the whole revelation in the Old Testament. By the expression *ὅλος ὁ νόμος* Christ represents the law as something complete in itself, as an organic whole. And he has thereby, not only to the Pharisees, but also to His disciples and the church, elucidated the old covenant, and revealed the pure kernel of God's will to His people. He has shown (1) that the law is a cohering unity, and (2) that it terminates in the disposition, in love to God and one's neighbor.

With this agrees the doctrine of Matt. xxiii. 23, that "the weightier matters of the law," in contrast with the moral spirit which is punctilious about trifles, and which makes the outward act everything, are "judgment, mercy and faith," that is, an inward regard to the distinction between right and wrong, then a merciful love, and finally uprightness and fidelity. Of these three Jesus says: "These *ought* ye to have done," while in a merely negative way He remarks of those external services, "and not to leave the other undone."

The earnestness with which Jesus maintains the authority of the divine law, appears from the language of His reply to the reproachful question of the Pharisees from Jerusalem, why his disciples by eating with unwashed hands, transgressed the tradition of the elders which reply charges the Pharisees with subverting the law of God by their human regulations: "And why do ye transgress the commandment of God by your

traditions?" Matt. xv. 3, *sq.* As proof of the charge Jesus pronounces the divine command to honor one's parents, annulled by the Rabbinic regulations respecting the *corban*; that is, gifts to the sanctuary by which children were exonerated from filial services. Here we have (1) a rejection of Rabbinic tradition, whether it was parallel with the word of God, or went beyond it, or was opposed to it; (2) a confirmation of the Mosaic law, with an emphatic disavowal of everything by which that law is either directly or indirectly undermined and weakened: "Thus have ye made the law of God of none effect:" cf. Matt. v., 18, "I am not come to destroy;" and (3) a plain declaration of the divine origin of the Mosaic law, (ἐντολὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν — ὑμεῖς λέγετε.)

The explanation of Jesus, in His Sermon on the Mount, accords with this statement. Returning to Matt. v. 17, 19, we examine it with special reference to the law. Jesus denies the καταλῦσαι and affirms the πληροῦσαι of the law by Himself. And as may be inferred from the distinction drawn between λῦειν τὰς ἐντολάς and διδάσκειν οὕτως, v. 19, the πληροῦσαι involves "doing" as well as "teaching." Jesus fulfilled the law as a perfect teacher, and likewise as a perfect doer of it; as a *doer*, since by his sinless life He fully satisfied the moral law, and by the work of *atonement*, in which He sanctified and offered himself for us, truly fulfilled and brought to an end the ritual law. (See *Bleek*, St. u. K., 1853, 2, 304.) As a *teacher* He fulfilled the law by showing them, especially in Matt. v. 21-48, how to understand aright and obey the commands. He treats in this passage six commands, viz.: the prohibition of murder, adultery and perjury, and the precepts concerning a bill of divorce, concerning retaliation, and concerning love to one's neighbor, and indeed by opposing *His own* to a current interpretation. But here there are two views depending on the conception which is formed of the authority to which Jesus opposed His ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν as a higher authority. *Faustus Socinus*\* and the rationalistic interpreters suppose that Jesus expresses *Him-*

---

\* Conceionis Christi, att. *sq.* explicatie.



*self* in opposition to the Mosaic law itself, assailing Moses. Neander even adopts this view in his life of Christ, but with the restriction that Jesus simply assailed the particularistic, political form of the Mosaic law, the stand-point of the law as such. We attach ourselves to the interpretation of *Luther, Calvin, Tholuck, Stier, De Wette*, which assumes that Jesus merely opposes the traditional interpretation and application of the Mosaic law by the rabbies. In favor of this we may appeal to the whole way and manner in which Jesus, as we have shown, regards and treats the Old Testament, and particularly the law, and then also to the immediate context; since it would be a manifest contradiction, as has been already urged, for Jesus here to assail the Mosaic law purely as such, and yet not intimate by a word that He annulled it. And still further, verse 20 expresses, not in words to be sure, but in substance, the sum of what follows in v. 21, to vi. 18—Christ enjoins upon His disciples a righteousness which far exceeds that of the Pharisees. The *Pharisees* manifestly, with their ideal of righteousness and their interpretation of the law, are in the Saviour's mind; hence not the pure righteousness of the old covenant itself, but the specific pharisaical righteousness and the traditional interpretation on which it rested. This view is supported by the further circumstance that Jesus in no one of the six cases which He treats says: "Moses said," as Mark vii., 10, but "ye have heard that it was said," or "it was said to them of old time." It would certainly be probable that the Rabbinic tradition and not the Mosaic record was meant, if the  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\rho\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$  were to be taken as an ablative in meaning, "It was said by them of old time." But how great soever a favorite this explanation may be with earlier and later expositors, and how categorically soever *Stier* defends it as the only correct explanation, the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament is nevertheless against it, as we must affirm with *Tholuck, Neander, and De Wette*; for while in four passages (viz. Rom. ix. 12, 26; Rev. vi. 11, ix. 4)  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\rho}\epsilon\theta\eta$  is joined with a dative in a sense unquestionably dative, there is not a single passage of the New Testament where the ablative meaning of the dative with  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\rho}\epsilon\theta\eta$  is fairly

made out; and our passage cannot of course afford such an instance without charging upon it an unrelieved ambiguity. If then we take the word to mean: "It was said to them of old time," Jesus starts with that which His audience were accustomed to hear (ἠκούσατε) from the mouth of the scribes in the synagogue, as what was said to the ancients; and the people always heard text and interpretation, Word of God and tradition, Mosaic teaching and Rabbinic, without separation or distinction. And the interpretation and tradition, as the Lord quotes it expressly in the first and last examples, but presupposes as known in the four other cases, was literal and superficial, degrading the moral law of God to the rank of civil law, or political and criminal jurisprudence, whereby encouragement was given to many a sin, and a fancied hypocritical righteousness and virtue were fostered. This perversion of the law Jesus opposes in the might of His authority (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν), reveals the spirit in the letter, goes back in all cases from the external word and deed to the inward disposition, insists upon purity of heart and perfect love, upon entire simplicity and truthfulness of speech, and upon a comprehensive love to one's neighbor, including under that name even an enemy. Thus apprehended, the whole polemic of Jesus is "an apology for Moses." (*Olshausen.*) His exposition does not in fact annul the law, but truly fulfils it, since it does not make the command more lax and external, but rather more inward, moral, and searching, disclosing the spirit which is bound up in the letter of the law, and thus bringing the law to perfection.

On one point of the Mosaic law, elucidated in the Sermon on the Mount, namely *divorce*, we find also in another place a very remarkable explanation of Jesus. The Pharisees proposed to Him the ensnaring question whether it is lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause or at pleasure—κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν. The question related to the different interpretations given to Deut. xxiv. 1, *sq.*, by *Hillel* and *Shammai*. *J. D. Michaelis* (*Mos. Recht*, II., 236, 244, *sq.*) furnishes information respecting this difference, and *tier* (*Redan Jesu*, II., 262) exhibits the same clearly and correctly. In His de-

cision Jesus passes by at first the codex of the law with its disputed interpretation, takes them back to the history of creation (Gen. i. 27 ; ii. 24) and shows particularly from that history that according to the will of God, the Creator, man and wife ought to be one ; from this He draws the practical inference that man should not put asunder what God has joined together, or made a united pair. He thus condemns the separation as *unnatural*, since "it is against nature that one flesh be cut asunder" (Chrys.), and as *sin*, because it is disobedience to the will of God, the Creator. But when the Pharisees, vexed at their disappointed expectation, clothe an objection in the question, "Why did Moses then *command* to give a writing of divorcement and put her away?" Jesus replies: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, *suffered* (permitted) you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so." This explanation is in many respects exceedingly instructive. *First*, because Jesus keeps carefully in view the text of the Mosaic law both as to its language and connection. The Pharisees speak hastily of a *command*, but Jesus says, Moses has only *permitted* divorce—ἐπέτρεψε—not ἐνετείλατο—a distinction which is confirmed by the most critical exposition of the text (see Michaelis, p. 232 sq.) ; since the design of the statute had direct reference only to the taking again of a dismissed wife already married to another, while the dismissal of a wife, provided a letter of divorce was given, is only presupposed and allowed. The original passage should probably be translated thus: "If a man take a woman and marry her, and it come to pass that she do not find favor in his eyes because he hath found a foul blemish in her, and he write her a bill of divorce and deliver it into her hand and send her from his house, and she go out from his house and go and become another man's, and the latter husband hate her and write her a bill of divorce, and deliver it into her hand and send her from his house, or if the latter husband who took her for a wife die, her former husband who sent her away, cannot take her again to be his wife after she has been defiled ; for it is an abomination before Jehovah," etc.—Deut. xxiv. 1, sq. *Secondly*, it is worthy of no-



tice, that Jesus restricted the Mosaic statute to *Israel*, by the words "suffered *you* to put away *your* wives," and taught them also by the clause "because of the hardness of your hearts," to regard it as adapted to a particular moral state of the people; and this latter view, especially, involves the idea of an education of the human race to be effected, according to the divine plan, by revealed truth. *Thirdly*, it is to be observed, that the Lord goes back of the Mosaic law, concerning the laxer or stricter interpretation of which the strife of the schools was busy, to the primeval history as a higher court (v. 4, ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὸ ἀρχῇς. v. 8, αὐτὸ ἀρχῇς οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως), and teaches them to esteem and follow the original order of God at the Creation as an absolute and ever-binding rule. *Fourthly*, He thereby ascribes not only a historical character, but also a divine authority to the Mosaic account of the creation, since he treats the word of Adam, Gen. ii., 24, as prompted by God, by ascribing it to the latter, and, moreover, appropriates and confirms the οἱ δὲ v. 5, which was inserted correctly as to the sense, by the Greek translators. And *finally*, Jesus claims for his own person and word, v. 9, the position of asserting the primal and divinely established rule, in contrast with the Mosaic rule, which was conditioned on the moral stupidity of Israel, and of restoring the former to its proper authority, which had been injured by intervening sin. In this respect also He acts not as a "destroyer," but as a fulfiller," for He carries out perfectly the chief design of the Mosaic law, which, because of the hardness of their hearts, it had been possible to effect but partially.

The declarations of Jesus respecting the *Sabbath* are of essentially the same kind. To combine all which, He said in this respect when His disciples plucked the ears of corn, and when He healed the man with a withered hand, we must first distinguish between the different points of view. He vindicates His free judgment and action in reference to the Sabbath, partly by the Scriptures, and partly by reason and natural custom. By the latter, when He appeals (Matt. xii., 11 sq.) to the fact, that no one has any conscientious scruples about rescuing on the Sabbath a domestic animal which has



fallen into danger, and therefore it should not be esteemed wrong to heal and save on the Sabbath a *man*, who is much better than a sheep. The Scriptural proof, on the other hand, is taken partly from the history of David's life, partly from the Mosaic law, and partly from the account of the creation. From the history of David Christ alleges the fact (Matt. xii. 3, *sq.*) that, in a case of necessity, David caused to be passed over to himself and his followers the show-bread, which by law belonged exclusively to the priests (1 Sam. xxi. 1, *sq.*, cf. Ex. xxix. 32; Lev. xxiv. 9), while both he himself and the priests were free from deserved reproach, as proof that "necessity knows no command." A second proof (v. 5) He takes from the Levitical law itself, since the priests must needs perform on the Sabbath many kinds of labor which would otherwise be a desecration of that day; but if these labors—this is the inference—were sealed as lawful and sacred by the sanctuary which they served, how much more may labor be sanctified when something holier, greater than the temple, is at stake. A third proof of special importance is fully preserved by Mark ii. 27, *sq.*: "The Sabbath was made *for* man and not man for the Sabbath." These words take us back beyond the Mosaic command, to the original and divine institution of the Sabbath, whereby the Sabbath *came to be* ἐγένετο (cf. xix. 8), and indeed with a statement of the object for which it was instituted, an object which is to be found not in the Sabbath itself, but in man; the Sabbath is a means, not man. By this declaration Jesus smites to the ground the rigorous, Pharisaic Sabbatical rules and regulations, since here, as in the matter of divorce, He goes back to the will of God the Creator, and to the original divine order. We also remark particularly that Jesus does not restrict this view to the people of Israel, but has all mankind in His eye, or, to speak philosophically, He puts the general idea of man at the foundation, yet not for the purpose of denying, annulling and destroying the Mosaic institutions, especially the Sabbath, but only to teach His hearers how to understand and apply the same correctly. (σὺ καταλύσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.) While the Rabbinic tendency of the later Judaism remained on this side the Mosaic law,

Jesus passes beyond that law to the creative will of God and the primeval history of man, particularly in respect to marriage and the Sabbath; of which one is the foundation of all social and civil life, and the other of all religious and devotional life, not merely in Israel, but in the human race. But how does the majesty and personal authority of Jesus as the beginner of a new humanity and the finisher of the creation shine forth in the concluding words! See Mark ii. 28. "So that the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," (and cf. Matt. xii. 8; Luke vi. 5.) That "Son of man" is not here equivalent to "man" but to "Christ," needs no proof, and that "Lord of the Sabbath" was meant to signify incomparably more than "the Sabbath was made *for* man," is likewise clear. There is a progress and climax in the thought; man as such is not for the Sabbath, was not designed to be a slave of the Sabbath, but to be free; and if this be so, then in harmony therewith— $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$  in Mark—is Christ the Son of man, the new beginner, and the finisher, the central point and the head of humanity, *Lord* of the Sabbath. But what does this mean? *So* Lord of the Sabbath, that He can abolish or confirm it at pleasure? This neither agrees with the  $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ , nor with the  $\text{\textit{\text{σάββατον διατὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐγένετο}}$ ; not with the latter, because the *original* Sabbath *as such* is perpetual, raised above the narrow circle of Israel, an absolutely general regulation of God for *all* mankind. But Christ is *so* Lord of the Sabbath, that he fulfills, renews, transforms it, and works in His disciples a right observance of it, the genuine  $\text{\textit{\text{σαββατίζειν}}}$ .

There is still another passage to be compared, namely, Jo. vii. 21, *sq.*, where Christ justifies the healing of a sick man at the pool of Bethesda, which took place on the Sabbath, by appealing to the fact that the rite of circumcision was continually performed on the Sabbath merely to avoid breaking the law which required it on the eighth day, and hence surely they had no right to be angry with him for making a whole man ( $\delta\lambda\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ ) well upon the Sabbath. Here Jesus plants Himself upon circumcision on the Sabbath in like manner as in Matt. xii. 5, upon the performance of Levitical labors in the temple on that day. But the parenthetical remark, "not

because it is of Moses, but of the fathers," which is added to the words "Moses gave you the law," is surprising, for it points us to something earlier than Moses, as do Matt. xii. and xix., in respect to the Sabbath and to marriage. But what is the import and bearing of the added clause? Does Jesus wish to deprecate circumcision as a form of the law not introduced by Moses, but only handed down from the fathers? (D. *Paulus* and *Baumgarten—Crusius*.) Or does He wish, on the contrary, to place it above the Sabbath as a primitive and holy institution, merely confirmed by Moses? (*Bengel*, *Lücke*, *Tholuck*.) Both these suppositions contradict, and equally, the view which Jesus elsewhere expresses of the old covenant, and the latter especially cannot be reconciled with his declaration concerning the Sabbath, Mark ii. 27. Yet we cannot regard the assumption of *Stier* and *De Wette*, that only an inaccurate *expression* was to be corrected by this clause, as worthy of Jesus. Grotius has the right view. *Circumcisio est antiquior RIGIDO OTIO Sabbati per Mosem imperato ;*" according to which Christ has not the Sabbatical institution *per se*, but only the strict Mosaic command respecting it, in mind, when He refers to the antiquity of circumcision, transmitted from the patriarchs, in order to show that the law of the Sabbath cannot withstand it. Hence it was not His design in this place by pointing to that which preceded the Mosaic law, to weaken or abrogate any part of this, but only to determine the proper *relation* of the divine commands and ordinances, and thus to fulfill the law.

We saw at the beginning of this section, that Jesus honored and observed the ordinances and institutions of the Mosaic law, by sending the healed lepers to the priests, by solemnizing the Jewish festivals, by visiting the synagogue on the Sabbath, and by going into the temple; and we may add, also, in this place, that He does not attack the offering of sacrifice on the altar, Matt. v. 23, *sq.* But to apprehend the truth fully, we must still remark that Jesus declares Himself, Matt. xii. 6, to be higher and holier than the temple—"A greater than the temple is here"—and that, immediately after, He has in holy zeal purified the temple, which he honors as His Father's

house (cf. Luke ii. 49) from criminal desecration. He declares prophetically, John ii. 19, that the temple will be perfectly destroyed by Israel, but in His own *person* and by Himself will be raised up again. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it again. (cf. the interpretation of *Hauff*, *Stu. u. Krit.*, 1849, I. 106, 114.) And finally, the language of Christ at the institution of the holy supper offers us a deep glance into His position towards the old covenant. Matt. xxvi. 28, we read: "This is my blood of the New Testament." By these words He glances at two passages of the Old Testament, one connected with the history of the covenant, Ex. xxiv. 8: "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you," and the other in the prophecy of a new covenant, Jer. xxxi. 31-34: "And I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel." (cf. *Steir*, R. J. vi., 148 sq.) Thus He founds the new covenant which had been already promised, and which does not abrogate or ignore, but rather fulfils and perfects the old. So, then, Jesus assigns to the Mosaic law and the old covenant, with their institutions, their true worth and position. He contemplates the law in relation and connection, partly with the primal revelation in the creation and earliest history of mankind, partly with its fulfilment and completion by the Son of man, and therefore with a religious as well as historical, a divine as well as human view, and he recognizes it as a true revelation of God, needing, however, its fulfilment and completion, and receiving the same in Himself.

(To be concluded)



## ARTICLE III.—BRYANT'S POEMS.\*

WE avail ourselves of the very convenient law of association by contrast to pass at once from the volume in prose, named below, to an examination of Mr. Bryant's poetry. Mr. Bryant has accomplished at least two things by this timely book. He has furnished the world with a fresh proof that he can write prose as well as poetry, and us with the reviewer's reason for gracing our pages with his name.

It is now, we believe, about the space of a generation since the American public first learned to associate the name of William Cullen Bryant with the *Evening Post* newspaper. During this unusually protracted term of editorial service, Mr. Bryant has taken frequent recesses from the exhausting demands of his profession. The intervals of leisure thus intercalated in a life otherwise laboriously occupied he has employed variously—in the main, however, dividing them between travel and foreign residence. More lately, if we mistake not, a country-seat on Long Island, beautiful by nature and beautified by art—the possession of a man who, if common fame speak not falsely of two honorable vocations, may be considered doubly fortunate to own it, in his double character of poet and of editor—has drawn him with the lure of leisure and letters.

But within the year past, the newspapers tell us Mr. Bryant has once more returned to do task-work as editor. Remembering that his age, though hale and vigorous still, is now advanced to "reverence and the silver hair," and recalling the fact that for the last decade and longer, his muse has but seldom broken the silence—the very sweetness, too, of these occasional utterances having to our fancy something of a cer-

---

\* Letters of a Traveller. Second Series. By William Cullen Bryant. New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1859.

tain rare and costly quality going to confirm the omen—we are forced to regard this step as an unwelcome reminder that our favorite American poet has probably accomplished his important poetical labors. It will not therefore be judged premature if we herewith attempt, what has thus far, and properly, remained unattempted, something like a general and exhaustive survey of his genius and achievements. We shall be confident, at least, that not a line of the thousands which, notwithstanding what we have written, we will hope yet to receive from that honored and practised hand, could modify our estimate, otherwise than to heighten our praise. And thus we beg to avert the ungracious omen implied in contemplating his poetical career for the moment as closed.

The frequent vicissitudes of labor and recreation with which the actual years of Mr. Bryant's life have been diversified and relieved, are no doubt to be considered as illustrative of his character. It was hardly to be expected that one who, in the flush of early manhood, according to the common tradition of Bryant (which we hope no one will be at the pains to contradict), turned from the profession of law, to which he had been trained, with an instinctive and noble rebellion against what he felt to be its pettinesses and falsities, should, even in the strenuous season of middle age, have so changed that honorable softness of heart as to become unalterably firm to the at least equally rude contacts and collisions of a partisan editorship. We should half have regretted it if he had done so. It would have gone so far toward marring a favorite ideal of ours (perhaps we got it from Coleridge), touching a certain inviolate youthfulness of feeling waiting ever on the nature of the poet, and making to him the freshness and beauty of the world immortal. We trust never to see the fantasy suffer under any such ruthless iconoclasm. Mr. Bryant, indeed, has always, as editor, practiced a skill which his political antagonists have felt to be even bitter, of straining every relenting chord of his nature to a mood of stern endurance. He is to-day, when grasping the newspaper pen, an almost savage antagonist. But then this tension is far more a matter of the will than of the heart. The will is strong, and can produce

it; but so is the heart tender, and will relax it. This we take to be the secret of Mr. Bryant's alternations between uncongenial toil and studious leisure.

In his last resumption of editorial duty, we make no doubt it is a manly resolution which summons him back once more to the wavering edge of a worldly strife. It suits admirably with that conception in his own grand hymn to freedom in which, boldly amending one of the world's immemorial ideals, he changes her sex, transforming a fair smiling maiden to a bearded man in panoply. We can even believe that he obeys a conscientious conviction of duty in the matter; and if so, then his act is in the spirit of all noblest poetry, let critics say what they will about the absurdity of a moral in song. Every poem has its moral, be it only in the absence of an intended moral. The author, for example, of some musical stanzas, reminiscent, as we recall them, of a day's ramble with friends in the woods, when he took pains to tell us that having spread food of God's sweet bounty, they

ate it with no grace but song,

was unconsciously pointing a moral advantageous neither to his piety, nor yet to his sense of the truest and highest beauty. It is indeed not unfrequently the case that the poet is impressing even the most instructive, while the saddest too of moral lessons, when so far as his own merit of purpose goes, he works

Without a conscience or an aim.

But notwithstanding the reconciliation which we may flatter ourselves thus to have found between two apparently contrasted phases of character, it must still be acknowledged that Bryant the editor and Bryant the poet could hardly be more different from each other if they were numerically distinct. It is like going from the Cave of the Winds to the "island-valley of the Avilion," to pass from a leader in the *Evening Post* to one of Bryant's more characteristic poems. In truth, the editor Bryant belongs to the world as it is—the poet Bryant to the world as it will be. The editor dwells

where good and evil are ceaselessly at strife—the poet where good has conquered and all is peace. The editor toils amid deformity and disorder—the poet rests in order and beauty perpetual and serene. A blending of the practical and the ideal tendency this, in a single nature, fortunate and rare indeed, yet common, we are inclined to think, to the reforming spirits of every age. They have been poets, all of them. Not all had leave to write their poetry. Milton had, and so had the stern old Hebrew prophets. Paul himself was not to be restrained from lifting up ever and anon throughout his epistles a sublime and exultant doxology, and Luther must occasionally refresh his battle-worn spirit with a hymn that pealed out like the call of a trumpet. But the patient epics of the most share in silence the earnest expectancy of the travailing creation. When God at last shall make all things new, then, in the clear and radiant forms of that final steadfast order, those of us who see it shall behold the fair ideal that they knew, and the poetry that they would have written. They endured while here as seeing that which is invisible. When we too see it, we shall understand how such an endurance could be nursed by such a vision.

The professional engrossments which have absorbed so large a share of Mr. Bryant's life, will explain in part why his poetry consists almost entirely of short detached pieces. Several of these, it is true, have been published under the title of 'Fragments,' and Mr. Bryant in a note has given us explicit encouragement to hope that the leisures of his life may have been employed upon some more considerable labor of verse yet to appear. But he has deferred our hope so long, that he will not blame us if we begin to doubt of its final fulfilment. It is certainly to be regretted that he has not seen fit to construct some single poem of more imposing dimensions to become the repository of his fame; less, however, we imagine, on our account than on the poet's own. It is hardly probable that our inheritance from his genius would on the whole have gained as much in richness as it might in bulk thereby. But Mr. Bryant would have secured his own reputation better—so long at least as the old transmitted epic standard of *volume*



continues to be applied, in professedly critical as well as in the popular appreciation, for the admeasurement of poetical genius. Mr. Longfellow may be supplanting Mr. Bryant in the general estimation. If so, some will attribute it to Mr. Longfellow's greater warmth of coloring. But we intend to maintain that it is due to nothing else in the world than the traditional veneration accorded to the man who has written a poem big enough to make a book.

But there is another reason for the fugitive character of Mr. Bryant's poetry. We have been assured by one whose opportunities of access and information entitle the statement to credit, that it has always been a virtual impossibility that Mr. Bryant should compose a continuous poem of great length. The process of poetical composition, it was stated, is so exhausting to his physical powers, that those persons who demand such a work at his hands, unconsciously ask him to build his own sepulchre. The knowledge of this fact will not be unsuggestive to the thoughtful lovers of Bryant's muse. It will remind them that nearly all their author's pieces have the air of recreations. Not mere sportive recreations surely; Bryant's is a spirit far too grave to seek relaxation in pure levity and wantonness, and his verse ever loves best to sing the "still *sad* music of humanity;" but diversions from the daily use of life, in which a high-born and beautiful genius, not declining to wear a yoke during the heat of every day, claims nevertheless the cool of an evening now and then to solace and cheer itself with grateful relief of occupation. 'The Ages,' Mr. Bryant's longest poem, is probably to be excepted here. This was originally prepared, we believe, for the anniversary of a literary society connected with Harvard University. It is far enough removed above the level of its class, and is even a poem of a high and remarkably uniform excellence; and yet in a certain appearance of effort to sustain itself, unnatural to Bryant's performances, it undeniably fails of that perfectly unbidden and unbought spirit of freedom else everywhere prevalent.

Spontaneous and free we call the prevailing quality of Bryant's verse. It is not so, however, in the sense of a wild heady

rage, like Byron's, spurning control. Quite to the contrary of this there reigns throughout it all, not indeed the quietude of a passionless nature, but the breathing rest of a spirit under mastery too strong to feel the disturbance of striving impulses. Byron's *flumen ingenii* might be fitly described in his own fine verse apostrophizing the Rhine.

And thou, exulting and abounding river ;

Bryant's flows full, deep, placid, clear, strong, equable—with a movement swift sometimes, occasionally impetuous, but never giddy with a flattered sense of power. Byron's want of moral self-control has just about fairly represented itself in the *abandon* of his verse. He wrote poetry in very much the same reckless way that he drank wine and loved women. No one else could have written the splendid stanza commencing 'The sky is changed,' with a reeling brain and a staggering hand. It was perfectly in character for Byron to do it. In all this Bryant is in intense contrast. The graceful poise, the easy majesty of self-possession, with which he invariably receives the ictus of inspiration, and, conscious of no shock, transmutes it silently into diffused and regulated power, we feel sure does not excel the even control that such a man must exercise over his moral nature.

We are not now paralleling Bryant with Byron. It would hardly satisfy our comparative estimate of the two men to rank them as "brethren in power." But this we are free to say, that were they fairly matched in genius, as they assuredly are not, then we should not hesitate an instant to put the American above the Englishman—the *style* of his greatness we consider so much superior. For despite the subscription of so justly eminent a critic as Ruskin, we glory in renouncing the popular superstition that venerates as the anointed highest of bards the man who has sacred frenzies, and cries of a sudden, 'I feel the God.' For our part, we crown the poet who scorns alike to suffer or to feign such violent invasion and usurpation of his faculties. We experience a far intenser sympathy with power, when the descending and confident deity is met on the threshold by one stronger than he. To change

the figure, we like to see the poet-cavalier 'turn and wind a fiery Pegasus' indeed, and the more fiery the better, but with use of spur and curb betokening *him* the master. His speed may not equal Gilpin's, but he will make up in dignity.

Such a poet, in his measure, is Bryant, and such a one, in his larger measure, was not Byron. Whatever power it is given Bryant to summon is subject to him. The power that went with Byron somehow often seized advantage and mastered him. If it will be permitted us to draw an illustration from things that use has not yet made either common or sacred for the service of such an analogy, we might say that when we read Bryant we have the feeling of the railway passenger who is confident that his engineer will employ no head of steam of which he has not the exact measure and full command; but that when we read Byron we have the feeling of the railway passenger who holds his breath with a nameless suspicion that his engineer's brain is crazed, and that he is intent upon nothing but annihilating time and distance. Bryant's consciousness of his strength, and his perfect contentment with its measure, will not let him seek any increment of momentum from an indulged excess of rapidity in movement. Byron's force, when at its maximum, is ever a product greatly augmented by a factor of purposely hastened *precipitancy*.

We readily grant, as we keenly feel, the delicious fascination of this careering velocity. Its recklessness is contagious. It is one of the most intimate of intoxications. But it *is* an intoxication, and it debauches the will. Its spell unnerves us, just as we know it unnerved the poet himself. We tremble with inmost weakness. There is a nobler excitement. We prefer to dwell with power that is sovereign of itself. It may conquer us, but it shall not be by dissolving our sinews. Nay, our own wills are conscious there of a strengthening presence. It is more than the touch of Antæus to his native earth. It is the miracle of Jacob's night of wrestling with the angel. We go stronger from that place of a mighty communion.

In harmony with the quality now illustrated, Bryant exercises a noble patience in employing the "last hand" of the

artist. This, no doubt, is the labor which exhausts him. Robert Hall, according to his own testimony respecting himself, was continually tormented with the desire to preach better than he possibly could. Mr. Bryant seems to finish his poems in view of a similarly impossible standard. But Hall's ambition, as pure of selfishness we can believe it to have been, as human ambition is likely soon to be, was at least worth something to the world. It spurred a splendid genius to exertions that made the greatest of modern preachers. Bryant's haunting ideal has prompted him to make such approaches to absolute perfection of finish, as no other poet has made since Horace elaborated his odes.

In assigning to these two poets so high a relative position among poetical artists, we would not, of course, be understood to use the designation in its larger and more honorable significance. Neither of them sketches with the ample hand of a Michael Angelo. Neither goes out into chaos, like Milton, and creates worlds that thenceforth seem actually to add something to the substance and extent of the universe. Nothing of this. Their genius is not level to such an imitation of Omnipotence, as few men's has been. But so does not their ambition aspire to it. They busy themselves with the minor moralities of the muse. They do not invite the use of the telescope to explore their works. They are well content if the finer eye of the microscope, multiplying their graces, discovers no flaws.

The art of verse, in this more limited and humbler sense, might be defined to consist in reconciling rhyme, measure, rhythm, all the externals by which, to the eye and the ear, poetry is differenced from prose, with the most authorized use of the language—in a word, in reconciling prosody with etymology and syntax. Certain licenses are allowed to poets, by immemorial prescription. These are pretty well ascertained, generally, and are limited in number. They constitute a sort of relief fund for poets in distress. Some slight shadow of reproach, more or less, attends resort even to this. Poets ought to make it a nice point of honor never to transcend it. Novelty in poetical license are rather worse than neologisms in diction. We of course except now such departures from the



law of prose as are matter of choice, for the sake of elegance, and not of necessity. These belong properly to the invention of the artist. They are suggestive of farther resources—like superfluous pots of gold on the counters of a specie-paying bank. Used with a frugal Attic taste, their effect is always pleasing. Compulsory deviations, on the contrary, especially if without good precedents, never fail to hint disagreeably of stringency—possible insolvency.

Bad rhymes, for example, are little better than no rhymes at all. They virtually confess that the artist was beaten and had to capitulate. Our best artists are sparing of them. The instances are rare in Tennyson. Yet Tennyson, marvellous artist that he is, shall double the number that are found in Bryant, page for page.

Halting rhythm is another confession of the imperfect artist—except, indeed, where it is chosen for its effect. It is an evidence of weakness unless it is an evidence of power. High passion is said to be naturally rhythmical in utterance. So it may be, but the highest passion has a rhythm of its own, and oftentimes jars a loftier music out of rugged metres. Such discord is the sign, not of the limitation, but of the excess, of power. Milton and Tennyson are masters in this kind. Mrs. Browning has passages of so high a mood, that their inharmonious music would seem to be the supreme attainment of an accomplished artist, did not the well nigh universal prevalence of the same difficult and obstructed movement induce a doubt whether it be anything more after all than the struggle of a deficient constructive faculty. Bryant is as perfectly, though not so variously, musical as Tennyson. Tennyson's permutations of melody are apparently endless; Bryant rings some exquisite changes, but they are fewer and simpler, and they recur more frequently. A favorite artifice, for example, with Bryant, always delicately managed however, is to break the monotony of his iambic verse by the introduction of a dactylic word where a trochaic one would be regular. The apostrophe occurring in the piece entitled 'Antiquity of Freedom,' already alluded to, presents a fine instance:

Oh Freedom ! thou art not, as poets dream,  
A fair young girl, with light and *delicate* limbs.

It will be noticed here how beautifully the effect of aerial sculpture, which the ear apprehends in this line, accomplishes the poet's descriptive purpose.

Bryant is guiltless of neologisms, which is more than can be said of the great English laureate. He seldom forces words out of uses which are normal and kindly to them. The intervals are long at which his even flight touches the ground in a prosaic expression. This last does happen, however, occasionally. In the 'Monument Mountain,' a partly narrative piece of blank verse, not unlike the minor manner of Wordsworth, Bryant tells us that the Indians are of the opinion

that God  
Doth walk on the high places, and *affect*  
The earth-o'erlooking mountains.

A word—it is entirely too common, in an ambiguous sense, to claim privilege as a classicism—which we venture to say so correct a taste as Mr. Bryant's would scruple to use even in prose. But the demands of versification, especially in moods of "cold obstruction," such as will clog sometimes the most fortunate genius, are not to be entreated. This poem rehearses the tradition of an Indian girl, who, smitten with love for her cousin (a passion deemed unlawful by her race), committed suicide by throwing herself from a precipice of rock. The mountain to which the precipice belonged afterward obtained the name of Monument Mountain, from its then being crowned by pious hands with a memorial pile of stones. Mr. Bryant's genius, we must think, is too essentially contemplative to feel its freedom perfectly in narration. There is, nevertheless, one incident in the poem under remark, conceived and told with a fine power of mild, penetrative pathos. The effect is not certainly the highest, but it is one of the very rarest in poetry. The melancholy maiden, with a bosom friend, the sole sharer of her secret, has climbed to the brow of the fatal precipice. The following words give the incident alluded to :

Here the friends sat them down  
*And sang all day old songs of love and death.*

The line in italics is not a striking line. Its effect is not felt immediately. It needs to be pondered—to be said over thoughtfully and tenderly, again and again. Then, if we mistake not, it will begin to assert over the rightly-prepared mind, a mystical influence as of a charm. Its vowel richness, its solemn consonant harmony, its laden spondaic movement, the exquisitely affecting union and contrast in the last three words, finally, the mournful thought of those poor children of the wood soothing the lone one's "imaginative woe" to the sad issue—all these conspire to produce a very sweet effect—sweet, at least, to him who knows how to submit himself to spells in words. Is it a merely whimsical suggestion that associates this line with that "most musical, most melancholy" place of the 'Paradise Lost,' where Milton describes how the gentler-spirited among the fallen angels solaced themselves with commemorating in dirges their valor and their misfortune?

Others, more mild,  
Retreated in a silent valley, sing  
With notes angelical, to many a harp,  
Their own heroic deeds, and hapless fall  
By doom of battle.

The stanza in Tennyson's 'Dream of Fair Women,' is like in spirit, but inferior far in beauty, which speaks of that ever-recurring spectacle in history—

Beauty and anguish walking hand in hand  
The downward slope to death.

We have been tempted a little aside. We were speaking of Mr. Bryant's freedom from the various besetting peccadilloes of poets. He almost never submits to say what he did not wish to, for the sake of completing a verse or a stanza—a surrender which is far more common with the poets than might be imagined. Byron abounds in instances. The exigences that *invite* such surrender are golden opportunities for

the skilful artist. They are to him what occasions of retreat are to the skilful general. Fortunately managed they display his resources better, oftentimes, than a brilliant success. In adroit hands these fruitful necessities have first and last given us not a little genuine poetry. They may sometimes fetter the free play of the fancy, but oftener they will prove ministers of timely suggestion. This is the reason why it is so much easier for a mediocre man to write passable rhyme than passable blank verse. It is also the reason why the most flexible, the most playful, and the airiest strains of sentiment and of fancy will so often be found to be most intricately versified. It is not more because such conceptions demand such expression, than because such expression admits such conceptions. The form gives the matter, in this case, as much as the matter gives the form. It requires a Shakespeare, a Milton (as in the 'Comus'), a Tennyson, to write playful blank verse. The unrhymed songs of the 'Princess' are almost solitary exceptions to the universal usage of the song-wrights of our literature. And after all the emergencies in versification, on which genius depends for suggestions, are of no use except to genius. They are sometimes stumbling-blocks to genius, when genius is impatient of art's delays. This however rarely happens with Bryant:

Another specification may fairly be made at this point. Mr. Bryant has too old-fashioned a regard for the rules of grammar to consider himself at liberty to transcend them lightly. Tennyson is inclined to be somewhat 'progressive' in this respect. It would be easy to show how cavalierly he treats the grammatical proprieties at times.

Now the scrupulous artist's conscience which Mr. Bryant keeps, is by no means the mere precisian's bondage to rule. There is a noble freedom in it. It is not the fond devotion that deifies and worships art as an end in itself. There is no idolatry in it. Bryant's art is always purest nature, not impelled, but impelling itself; not restrained, but restraining itself. It is like that last attainment of the good, proposed by a profound theology. It is freedom, reconciled with the highest necessity. Unobtrusive as such results of art, like all



negative excellences, must be, it is yet a separate source of peculiar pleasure, in reading poetry, to feel sure always that you are not going to meet with incessant occasion for subtractions from the total effect, on account of artistic blemishes.

We incidentally alluded to Horace, some pages back, as Bryant's parallel in finish of execution. There is not wanting some degree of likeness between the two in several respects. Horace was disqualified, by his painfully slow and laborious habits of composition, for the execution of a long poem. It might have cost him his life; but, at all events, the uniform brilliancy which his exquisite polish would have imparted to the whole would, perhaps, frustrate the proper effect of a long poem—the idea of which, we suppose, is realized in a work capable of being read and appreciated at a single sitting. A poem too long for this is not really one poem, but more; for Poe's theory has its confirmation in every man's reason and experience. But a poem by the Horace whom we know, much exceeding in length the longest of those which he has left us, would defy adequate appreciation at one sitting. The trance of *mimic* inspiration which the poet must produce in his readers to qualify them for such an appreciation, like all intense emotions, passes too soon. Horace seems to have been aware of this, and he wisely expended his power in producing poems of just manageable dimensions. Bryant has done the same, and probably for similar reasons.

These considerations, if we are wise, we shall suffer to influence our appraisal of such men's achievements. There are poets whose quality will not wait to hear the judgment of a second thought. It resents a moment's delay as an insult. Its appeal is to a sense like the pole of a magnetic battery, which must kindle immediately or remain cold. Far otherwise is it with Horace. The man who should set out to read the Odes without bringing to his task an eye adapted by nature, and refined by culture, to look for curious felicities that demand and repay a delaying notice—forms of words absolutely perfect, like the archetypes of nature, and composing spells of power—thoughts elaborately polished and clear, like cut diamonds, but hiding away, after the manner of all most

precious things, in cloistered recesses of expression—he, we say, who should undertake the Odes of Horace without a faculty of discernment for all these, and more, must consent to abide in helpless wonder that the ever-forgiven egotist's prophecy of his own unfailing longevity of fame should yet be enjoying so remarkable a fulfilment :

Exegi monumentum perennius ære.

Each trait of Horace, now enumerated, is a point of further resemblance between him and Bryant.

It will be observed that nothing, thus far said, implies any parallel between the two as to choice of subjects. Here, in fact, the resemblance fails—less, it may be, from lack of the natural congeniality to produce it, than from difference of conditioning circumstances—though probably in a degree from both. Horace's powers of shrewd moral observation, and his long-continued urban and polite associations made him eminently a poet of men and manners. Bryant is not ignorant of the world, and he bears no morbid hatred to men, but he knows Nature better, and loves her more. Nor seems his passion unreturned. She imparts to him a thousand secrets kept sacred from man's knowledge and speech since the morning stars sang together. It is wonderful, the number of mysteries she will breathe in his ear, and sign to his eye, and dart through his frame in electrical notices, during an hour's communion with her. She can trust them safely to him. No other is so patient to interpret them truly. Such patience could come only from such love.

Now, of course, it would be the infirmity of charity to reckon any certain poem as in the slightest degree intrinsically more valuable, simply because it cost its author nine years of labor and of waiting. Much less, however, would we admit the vulgar interpretation of that least learned of classic commonplaces, *Poëta nascitur, non fit*. Rightly interpreted it expresses aptly enough one of the most indubitable of facts. But as it is popularly understood, it would seem to import nothing less than that the thing poetry itself comes into exist-

ence somehow without any one's responsible agency, being, so far as concerns the poet producing it, merely a sort of fine secretion of the curiously adapted brain. Wresting thus the fortunate phrase of a poet, who perhaps never made a line, the history of which, if written, would not rebuke the violence, many proceed to gauge their value of a poem, as nearly as may be, in the inverse ratio of the pains known to have been expended upon it—apparently under the impression that hard work and the divine afflatus, so-called, are an impossible binomial.

Now, certainly, as between *misapplied* pains and simple carelessness, no one could think of suspending his choice for a moment. The vulgarity of art is immeasurably more disgusting than the vulgarity of Nature—more disgusting because more intensely vulgar. Art, indeed, in the sense in which we are now using it, that is, to denote the pains bestowed by the artist in his work, is merely Nature giving attention to itself. It is Nature in a mood of self-consciousness. Thus, to speak like a mathematician, it is limited to yield a *higher power of Nature*. A genius therefore naturally constituted pure and noble, while as a matter of course, it is always liable to be debased with vulgarity of various kinds, as coarseness, witness Shakespeare—or artificiality, witness Corneille and the French dramatists of that time generally—through the outward influence of a depraved standard of taste prevailing in a given country or period, still will only be purified and ennobled by its own freely chosen processes of self-culture. What made Madame D'Arblay exchange a style that charmed mankind by its simple graces for one that offended all by its elaborate mannerisms was not excess of art. It was not, in its present meaning, art at all. The fact was, her genius ceased to be a law unto itself, and imitated; and imitation is not art, but affectation.

We shall hardly need to say that Mr. Bryant, whether more by the good fortune of his position in the literary republic, or by the safeguard of a singularly chaste æsthetic quality in his genius well adapted to purge off all "baser fire," has quite escaped contagion from without. Thoroughly artistic, his

poetry is equally inartificial. We will not affirm that Bryant has made the most that was possible of his genius; but we have no hesitation in saying that he has made the most that was possible of his poetry. He might perhaps have achieved more had he attempted more. But thus much is certain, he has achieved whatever he has attempted. His poetry is not the loftiest, but it is the most perfect of poetry. Its ideal may be comparatively humble, but it wants little, very little of being completely realized. We do not care to make account here of one or two poems which Mr. Bryant has written in the humorous vein. His genius certainly does not laugh so naturally as it weeps. But the lines 'To a Musquito' are not, in our opinion, so wholly unsuccessful as some critics, who appear to have imagined that they could pronounce safely from Mr. Bryant's acknowledged more prevailing manner, would have us think.

We are aware that we have written extraordinary praise. We shall not pretend to justify it by citations. In fact it is such praise as can be competently passed upon in review only by one who will become tolerably familiar with Bryant's poetry as a whole. His poetry is not beautiful and perfect in parts, as one's is whose inspiration comes on him by fits. It is not faultless here and there, by an occasional felicity. It is uniformly finished by the law of his genius. Yet there are, of course, passages pre-eminent in excellence. We must be permitted to cite a few, notwithstanding that they may be already the favorites of many of our readers. The following stanza is from the 'Indian Girl's Lament.' The maiden's lover has died, and she chants her sorrow and her hope over his grave. In accordance with the superstition of her race she supposes her brave to have gone to the well-wooded and well-watered hunting grounds of the blest,

Where everlasting autumn lies  
On yellow woods and sunny skies.

She imagines that memory of *her* has directed his employments in the spirit-land:



And thou, by one of those still lakes,  
 That in a shining cluster lie,  
 On which the south wind scarcely breaks  
 The image of the sky,  
 A bower for thee and me hast made  
 Beneath the many-colored shade.

The luxury of repose, the warm, the mellow, the fructuous coloring, the pictorial light, the sweet naturalness of fancy, and the luscious melody, that are associated here, make the picture magical even beyond what the magic of such an original could be.

The following lines, from the 'Hurricane,' are descriptive of a tropical tempest, bursting in that long, rattling, interrupted crash of thunder which even our climate sometimes hears :

And hark to the crashing long and loud  
 Of the chariot of God in the thunder-cloud ;  
 You may trace its path by the flashes that start  
 From the rapid wheels where'er they dart,  
 As the fire-bolts leap to the world below  
 And flood the skies with a lurid glow.

What a delicious music in the delicately alliterative line italicized below. It is from the 'Green River.' The poet would fain linger by that fresh meadowy water side,

Till the eating cares of earth should depart,  
*And the peace of the scene pass into my heart.*

Please, reader, try that over again, aloud this time, and observe with what a fine effect the anapæstic movement is arrested at 'pass' with a dactyl, and then sent forward in an iambus. That's the scansion of it, dear reader, upon our honor, and never you mind the grammars. We *hope* you would not scan

And the peace | of the scene | pass in | to my heart.

That would be truly regular and sad.

Running our eye again and again, here and there and everywhere, over these delectable pages, in the pauses of our writ-

ing, we are conscious of a sentiment akin to remorse at having seemed to intimate that we are culling the best passages of our poet, or even that there is any inequality of excellence observable at all. We wish that we only had our readers at our mercy—right here in our "*sanctum!*" We would give them page after page, *ore rotundo* (where it would do—in our best style at any rate), and make *them* choose if they could. It is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Bryant's delineations of nature are more beautiful than nature itself. Or to speak more exactly, that the effect on us wrought when we read, surpasses that wrought when we observe. For, in the first place, Mr. Bryant can show us nature precisely as he sees it, and few of us have an eye like his; and, in the second place, there is the superadded pleasure of the imitation. He thus does *more* for us than his own sweet verse makes the odor-laden land breeze do for the home-sick mariner on the sea, where it is said that,

Listening to its murmur he shall deem  
He hears the rustling leaf, and running stream.

It is such an illusion and something besides. And should we also add here another element which will seem almost incompatible with the perfect fidelity that we have attributed to him as a limner of nature—namely, that he diffuses over his pictures somehow always a charm of his own tender, half-pensive subjectivity?

The quivering glimmer of sun and rill.

And darted up and down the butterfly  
That seemed a living blossom of the air.

The housewife bee and humming bird.

They have not perished—no!  
Kind words, remembered voices once so sweet,  
Smiles, radiant long ago,  
And features, the great soul's apparent seat.

Addressing Freedom, supposed to confront his ancient,  
though 'later-born,' enemy—Tyranny:

The grave defiance of thine elder eye.

But there must be a limit to quotations, and we will stop with a couple of stanzas from the little poem entitled 'June.' This poem rehearses a poet's reasons for preferring a pleasant rural resting-place for his dust to any other. We remember to have been, last summer, one of a little company of friends who walked out late in the "all-golden afternoon" of a serenely beautiful day, to visit such a spot in a quiet country town in New-England. We gathered near the sacred marble, and stood, silent or talking in low tones of him who rested there, when, in an interval of silence, one of our number, hardly interrupting it, began to recite the little poem under remark. Line after line, and stanza after stanza, its sweetness and appropriateness appeared so exquisite that she who had given that pleasant meadow-mound the most was tranced in tearful musing. As if by common consent, lingering yet a thoughtful moment or two, we moved slowly and silently away—but *she* was not satisfied until the poem was secure in her possession. But here are the promised stanzas:

I know, I know I should not see  
The season's glorious show,  
Nor would its brightness shine for me,  
Nor its wild music flow ;  
But if, around my place of sleep  
The friends I love should come to weep,  
They might not haste to go.  
Soft airs, and song, and light, and bloom,  
Should keep them lingering by my tomb.

These to their softened hearts should bear  
The thought of what has been,  
And speak of one who cannot share  
The gladness of the scene ;  
Whose part in all the pomp that fills  
The circuit of the summer hills,  
Is—that his grave is green ;  
And deeply would their hearts rejoice  
To hear again his living voice.

The tenderness and delicacy of thought and the melody of rhythm in this little piece are unsurpassed. The execution not only cannot be improved, but what is more, it needs no

improvement. We cannot help thinking, however, that Mr. Bryant stayed his hand at least one stanza too soon. That Christian mourner whom his verse comforted would, we are confident, have been doubly grateful had he gone on to speak, as *he* could speak, of other fields, golden under another light. It was surely worthy of a Christian poet to open *such* a landscape upon the hills of immortality. It could not have marred the artistic perfection of his work to beautify a picture so beautiful, by transfiguring it in unborrowed light.\*

Years we remember intervened between the writing of Tennyson's 'May Queen' and the adding of the 'Conclusion.' It would be a noteworthy and noble thing if Mr. Bryant should yet put his hand to the task of furnishing a like supplement to one of his purest and sweetest inspirations. The appropriateness of the conception almost forgave the temerity of the attempt and the crime of the forgery, when a few years

---

\* Not in the least as conceiving ourselves to have accomplished what we trust we have the grace to know but one hand in Christendom could attempt without presumption, we venture to print the following lines by way of rudely illustrating our idea. The stanza which they may possibly serve in some degree to hint to the imagination of the reader, would, according to our conception, immediately succeed the last of the two quoted in the text, and thus conclude the piece :

Then gently o'er their hearts at last  
A soothing change should steal—  
The darkness of the pensive past,  
The sense of dawn should feel ;  
The tearful memory of their friend  
In tranquil tearful hope should end,  
The scene a scene reveal,  
Where breeze, and song, and light, and bloom  
Have found a land without a tomb !

We at first amused ourselves with trying how easily, by a few changes, the closing stanza of the poem might be turned from its aspect toward the past, and made 'to deal with the other distance.' It seemed more exquisitely in harmony with the avowedly cheerful tone of the piece, that it should end with anticipation rather than retrospect. But then it was undoubtedly a true touch of nature to let a song which had bravely undertaken to rejoice against great Death, have somewhere in it a cadence of "more prevailing sadness." Still, was there not one further possibility, both of naturalness and of beauty, in making it finally recover, or *almost* recover, the key with which it started ? We imagine that here was a place where the wayward poetic fancy might safely have its will quite unchecked—like an Æolian harp.



ago a gentleman in Maine published a short poem purporting to be a 'Sequel' to the 'Thanatopsis,' by the hand of Mr. Bryant. It was too crudely versified for the hand that has lost none of its cunning since composing the marvellous harmony of the 'Thanatopsis,' at eighteen, and it was otherwise disfigured by blemishes; but as the writer proceeded, by way of completing the idea of Bryant's famous conclusion, to tell how (we quote from memory of seven or eight years ago), when we

Have passed our night-time in the vale of death,  
And struck our white tents for the *morning* march,  
We shall move forward to the eternal hills,  
Our foot unwearied and our strength renewed  
Like the strong eagle's, for the upward flight!

really these closing lines seemed to us lighted up with a transient gleam of not much inferior majesty.

We are not accusing Mr. Bryant of the fault—though there are one or two conspicuous instances in which he has made us wish to see him avoid it by a wider margin—when we venture to suggest that too much poetry is written now-a-days as if we had not yet unlearned heathenism. Is heathenism more poetical than Christianity? Is it not true that Christianity has shed over all things a new consecration—"the light that never was on sea or land?" We submit that it is something besides wickedness for the heirs of eighteen Christian centuries to write poetry as if they were heathen. Tallyrand might pronounce it folly worse than wickedness. It does not seem out of place, nay, it excites an emotion thrilling and solemn, even to the verge of sublimity, to come upon such a paragraph as the following, in the pages of Ruskin ('Seven Lamps of Architecture'):

I have paused, not once or twice, as I wrote, and often have checked the course of what might otherwise have been importunate persuasion, as the thought has crossed me, how soon all architecture may be vain, except that which is 'not made with hands.'

This is noble, and who will assume to say that such language does not become a Christian critic and author? We

do not mean to put forth any over-strained notions about this matter, for we entertain none. We are far enough from desiring to gird either author or artist about with a stringent sense of obligation to be always thrusting forward a religious or moral lesson. We believe in poetry that would not come under the category of either 'Divine' or 'Moral' songs. We believe in art that represents other than Biblical subjects. There is ultimate authority for the opinion that whatever is not directly hostile to God is friendly and helpful. We have just been alluding to the instance of an Englishman still living and in the prime of his powers who, uniting earnest piety to elegant taste, without degrading either, has devoted a lifetime to the single province of Art-criticism, so-called. A narrow judgment might perhaps consider this an unworthy devotion of sanctified genius. We think otherwise. But to Mr. Ruskin himself it must be a confirmation of his conscientious choice, as unexpected as gratifying, to know that a celebrated American preacher is largely indebted to him for that astonishing faculty of illustration which, more than any other one thing, has made his pulpit a power on this continent. This unanticipated utility of a labor which would have been amply contented could it only transfer the myriad influences of art as teacher to the side of "the true, the beautiful, and the good," goes to prove the words of the poet, that

liberal applications lie  
In art a nature.

We shall learn by-and-by that Heavenly Wisdom allows for wide distances sometimes between causes and effects, and that the Divine purposes are accomplished with much division of labor.

As the 'Thanatopsis' is at once the best known, and one of the finest, as well as one of the earliest of Mr. Bryant's productions, and as, moreover, it enjoys the distinction of being the first American verse that won a European recognition, we have supposed that it might gratify some of our readers to see this poem in the form which it wore when originally given to the public in the "North American Review."

When the conductors of that periodical first examined the piece, they affirmed that it could not be of American origin. They thought it too perfect in its versification. It will be noticed, however, that Mr. Bryant has re-touched it since then with great success. A comparison of this early text of the 'Thanatopsis' (itself, no doubt, painfully elaborated) with that which appears in his latest editions will illustrate what we have said on preceding pages of Mr. Bryant's admirable patience and unfailing taste in finishing his work. The critics of a former day, in announcing the alterations, express concern lest the poet might have committed the error of so many, and marred with an after-hand the first beauty of his workmanship. But their apprehension was groundless. It is a foregone conclusion that Mr. Bryant's artistic labor is always well bestowed. Here is the 'Thanatopsis,' as it appeared in the "North American Review" for September, 1817.\*

Not that from life and all its woes  
The hand of death shall set me free ;  
Not that this head shall then repose  
In the low vale most peacefully.

Ah ! when I touch time's farthest brink,  
A kinder solace must attend ;  
It chills my very soul, to think  
On that dread hour when life must end.

In vain the flattering verse may breathe  
Of ease from pain and rest from strife ;  
*There is a sacred dread of death*  
*Inwoven with the strings of life.*

This bitter cup at first was given  
When angry *Justice* frowned severe,  
And 'tis the eternal doom of heaven  
That man must view the grave with fear.

———— Yet a few days, and thee  
The all-beholding sun shall see no more  
In all his course ; nor yet in the cold ground,  
Where thy pale form was laid with many tears,

---

\* Not 1816, as stated in the New American Cyclopaedia.

Nor in the embrace of ocean shall exist  
Thy image. Earth that nourished thee shall claim  
Thy growth, to be resolved to earth again ;  
And, lost each human trace, surrendering up  
Thine individual being, shalt thou go  
To mix forever with the elements,  
To be a brother to the insensible rock  
And to the sluggish clod, which the rude swain  
Turns with his share and treads upon. The oak  
Shall send his roots abroad and pierce thy mould.  
Yet not to thy eternal resting-place  
Shalt thou retire alone—nor couldst thou wish  
Couch more magnificent. Thou shalt lie down  
With patriarchs of the infant world—with kings,  
The powerful of the earth—the wise, the good,  
Fair forms, and hoary seers of ages past  
All in one mighty sepulchre. The hills,  
Rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun—the vales  
Stretching in pensive quietness between ;  
The venerable woods—the floods that move  
In majesty, and the complaining brooks  
That wind among the meads and make them green,  
Are but the solemn decorations all  
Of the great tomb of man. The golden sun,  
The planets, all the infinite host of heaven  
Are glowing on the still abodes of death,  
Through the still lapse of ages. All that tread  
The globe are but a handful to the tribes  
That slumber in its bosom. Take the wings  
Of morning, and the Borean desert pierce,  
Or lose thyself in the continuous woods  
That veil Oregon, where he hears no sound  
Save his own dashings—yet—the dead are there,  
And millions in those solitudes, since first  
The flight of years began, have laid them down  
In their last sleep—the dead reign there alone.  
So shalt thou rest—and what if thou shalt fall  
Unnoticed by the living, and no friend  
Take note of thy departure ? Thousands more  
Will share thy destiny. The tittering world  
Dance to the grave. The busy brood of care  
Plod on, and each one chases as before  
His favorite phantom. Yet all these shall leave  
Their mirth and their employments, and shall come  
And make their bed with thee !



The points of difference between the above and the present state of the poem are worthy of note. In the first place, the original draft does not appear to have any *aim*. It is, in fact, *remarkably* aimless. It is simply an accumulation of images and reflections about death, in themselves neither very striking nor partaking of any definite character, as consolatory or otherwise, but expressed in singularly harmonious and even majestic verse. We should not blame the conductors of the Review if they had declined the piece on account of the defect now pointed out. It would have been very foolish, however, and we are glad they did not. It was evidently Mr. Bryant's first care, in the revision, to give the poem a determinate *direction*. This he does by means of sixteen new introductory lines, substituted for the original poem, in which also he takes occasion to mend the broken verse that stood first before—thus relinquishing a privilege which we have no doubt he now agrees with us, should be left entirely to the ladies. It was better, too, that an introduction in a heterogeneous metre should disappear, even at the cost of those two lines in the third stanza which we have taken the liberty to italicize. The object, as now conveyed in the most mellifluous of verse, is to draw from nature what solace she may have for us in view of "God's ordinance of death." It would be malicious to hint that Mr. Bryant, in impressing this character upon the poem, has not quite avoided a fault of incongruity. At least it is not easy to see how he could have found his meditations very consoling. If such a strain of musing fairly represents the best that Nature can do, we pity the pantheists, and all others her children, who are shut up to suck at the breasts of her consolations. Perhaps it does, and the Maine forger, whose success might seem more encouraging, possibly was interpreting nature in a light not her own when he discovered symbolisms of immortality in the resurrections of spring-time. We are nowise sure that simple Nature is in the least degree a more sympathizing mother than Mr. Bryant represents her.

Another improvement was the appending of a magnificent conclusion—completing a broken line again—in which occurs

the only word in the whole piece, as it now stands, which a cultivated heathen might not have written—'*trust*.' That saves it, but it might have been saved more abundantly. The attentive eye will mark the numerous minor changes throughout the body of the poem. These, some of them, depend on reasons of meaning, of taste, and of rhythm, which will elude all but the nicest observation. How nobly, for example, it complements the enumeration to add to 'hills,' and 'vales,' and 'brooks,' and 'rivers' that last particular,

and poured round all,  
Old ocean's gray and melancholy waste.

The substitution of 'rivers' for 'the floods,' besides being in itself an improvement, and an improvement as allowing the omission of the article (which both for the sense and the euphony were better away), enriches at once the variety and the grandeur of the rhythm. It is plainly finer to say:

The venerable woods—*rivers* that move  
In majesty——

than

The venerable woods—*the floods*, etc.,

and for yet a further reason, which is likely to have been the suggestive one of all, namely, that it avoids the jingle between 'woods' and 'floods.' The change of 'glowing' to 'shining'—

The golden sun,  
The planets, all the infinite host of heaven  
Are *glowing*, etc.,

is perhaps the best *time*-mark that the comparison furnishes. 'Glowing' belongs evidently to the fervent period of youth, 'shining' to the cooler age of later life. The younger poet sacrificed keeping, even truthfulness of description, to a more striking word—the older was content to merge a specific in the general effect, by using the word that was simply natural and appropriate. Immediately following the 'Thanatopsis' in the Review, is the 'Inscription for the

Entrance to a Wood,' under the title of 'A Fragment.' A collection of the two forms of this poem, would be a further study of great interest, in Mr. Bryant's art of finishing verse; but we have already transcended the limits which we had perscribed to ourselves, and we forbear.

We indicate in a closing paragraph the opinion which we think will in the end be generally formed of Mr. Bryant's merits as a poet. Coleridge has somewhere recorded his judgment that of all vocations that of the poet can least afford to dispense with undivided and unintermitting attention on the part of him who aspires to supreme excellence in it. If we admit the correctness of this judgment (and on precisely such a point, we should not know where to look for a higher authority than Coleridge), it will be pretty much equivalent to acknowledging that Mr. Bryant, in paying as he has done only an extremely desultory suit to the muses, has chosen his rank among the goodly fellowship of the minor poets of our language. What different fame might perchance have been his, had he, like Wordsworth, devoted himself exclusively to poetry, it were idle to conjecture. As it is, while his poetry seldom if ever displays anything of that fine, that ethereal light, mingled of philosophy and the imagination, which at intervals so transforms the otherwise uninspired manner of Wordsworth, we are free to adventure the assertion, that in the article of description, thought by some to be the crowning excellence of the great English master, Bryant easily surpasses him—though here again it is to be confessed that he has perhaps nowhere attempted description on so grand a scale as is done in, say, the magnificent sunrise scene in the first book of the 'Excursion,' or the still more splendid cloudscape toward the close of the second. A picture of Bryant's may be idealized like a Raphael, but it will never violate the sacred truth of nature. The sunbeam has hardly more reverence for the truth in representation than has Bryant. We doubt if there is a line, or even so much as one word, of description in his volumes that might not be rigorously verified from the right aspect of nature. And his poetry is "racy of the soil." His scenery is not Grecian, nor

Italian, nor yet English, but American scenery. This characteristic belongs to his perfect sincerity and truthfulness. He is a national poet, simply because he is a genuine poet—just as every man who truly represents human nature at large will also, in its proportion, represent a nationality. But he is not in any sense the poet of a party—political, social, literary, philosophical, or religious—like some of his countrymen that might be mentioned. The charm of his poetry therefore is purely poetical. The estimation which he enjoys is due in no degree to local or temporary circumstances. It cannot diminish save in the necessary and natural perspective of the expansion of literature, and of time. There is no example in the language, of a purer poetical diction than Bryant's. The vocabulary that might be made from his poetry, would be a "well of English undefiled." And the moral quality of his verse—we have no fear of profaning a sacred phrase—it is *clear as crystal*. There is absolutely nothing anywhere in all that he has written, either said or suggestively unsaid, that would not show clean and white against the cheeks of the mountains—

Where they purely lift  
Snows that never wasted in a sky,  
Which hath no stain.

And it is not merely innocence, that may be ignorant of temptation. It is virtue that has been exercised and crowned. He is sufficiently subjective to make us feel that his own nature, and the whole of it, is on the side of Right and Duty. He utters words

That make a man feel strong in speaking truth.

Indeed we suspect that it is this severe purity which some have condemned for coldness. But Bryant is not cold. He does not, like Byron and Schiller, seek by unnatural stimulants, to exhibit an unnatural *hectic* flush of passion. But we misread the 'Death of the Flowers,' the 'Green River,' the 'Rivulet,' the 'Past,' and many other of his pieces, if they are not suffused with a roseate glow which is



far enough from frigidness. His passion is taken up into the intellect and the imagination and sublimated there, but not extinguished. It is extinguished, however, to those who have long received "familiar the fierce heat" of Byron. Mr. Bryant's prevailing tone is undoubtedly mild and contemplative. His is, pre-eminently, the "harvest of a quiet eye." He wins the most from nature when he finds her gentle and placid in her moods. And it is easy with him for the lid to grow heavy with tears while the eye looks out on man or nature. The minor key of sadness, which belongs to all our deepest emotions, and perhaps points to the great tragedy of the race, runs through Bryant's poetry. But he is not always either mild or sad. The 'Song of the Stars,' the 'Song of Marion's Men,' the 'Hurricane,' and some other pieces, are instinct with the authentic lyrical fire. There is not a finer specimen of its kind in the language, than the 'Hurricane.' Bryant has been charged with monotony in treatment. There is ground for the charge, yet any one who will read in comparison, the 'Evening Wind,' the 'Summer Wind,' and the 'Hurricane,' must confess that he was not monotonous for want of a very considerable range of power. The 'Antiquity of Freedom' has a breadth, a vigor, and a loftiness in it almost Miltonic. Mr. Bryant was not graduated before leaving college, we believe, but he stayed long enough to snatch those nameless graces of culture which no length of stay could impart to anything but genius. His pages accordingly, have the garnish of occasional classicisms, not frequent, but always in exquisite taste. He also practises that incommunicable art—more than anything else perhaps a crucial test of genius—by which words, single words, are impregnated and polarized and made many-sided prisms of multiform suggestion. He has apparently never wrestled with great spiritual doubts and fears. At any rate his verse does not incline at all to "handle spiritual strife." For this reason he will not exercise an important office as teacher. This has been given to poets not a few (we hope soon to devote a paper to one of the chief of them), but Mr. Bryant is not of the number. He will, however, fulfil a

mission as beautiful in furnishing language for the gentler emotions and the purer experiences of many a grateful heart. There will never come a time when the good will wish that his mission were ended.

---

ARTICLE IV.—INTERNAL EVIDENCES THAT THE  
BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD.

Our subject assumes the existence of God, and that we have some knowledge of his character from sources independent of the Bible. With these data we examine the Bible and question it for proof from within that its author is this God, possessing this known character. If it is truly God's Book, the arguments from within ought to be neither few nor trivial. The ease with which we are able to identify the author of any work, whether of literature, science, or art, is mainly proportioned to the peculiarities of that author, his marked excellencies or defects. Thus we would not readily mistake for the classic eloquence of Everett mere pedantic bombast; for a Madonna of Raphael the first effort of a school-girl; for the star-studded dome of heaven some curious art imitation. So we should expect, *à priori*, little difficulty in deciding, from internal evidence, whether the Bible is from man or from God. God's works are not as man's works. They all bear the impress of His own infinite mind. They are all pregnant with evidence of their Divine origin, and the Bible no less than His other works.

But *just what*, and *how much* can be proved by this kind of evidence? This question ought to be correctly answered before proceeding to the argument, in order to prevent constant misapprehension and disappointment. We think it cannot be thus proved: 1st. That *our canon* is the *whole* of God's Word; nor, 2d. That the *whole* of *our canon* is God's Word. Evidently the *first* statement cannot be proved, since we cannot reason from what we *have* upon what we have not. The *second*

cannot be proved, since there are many passages of a nature such that it involves no absurdity to suppose them interpolations. *External* evidence is essential to the satisfactory decision of these points, or rather external evidence combined and harmonizing with internal evidence. We might, however, bring to our aid the *à priori* argument, that *it is not likely* that God would allow any of his revelations to man to be lost, and *it is likely* He would keep his truth free from the admixture of human error. That which can, we think, be proved by our present mode of reasoning is, that the Bible *substantially* and *in the main* is from God.

That we may start upon our argument with minds unbiased by the many and plausible objections which have been urged against revealed religion, drawn from internal evidence, it may be well to revert to the argument of Bishop Butler, in which, by showing that the same or similar objections lie against the belief that God is the author of Nature, he has not only rendered the objections futile, but has even made them of efficient service in proving the identity of the Author of Nature with the Author of Revelation. (*Butler's Analogy*, part 2d.)

Our limits will permit us but briefly to notice the more apparent evidences of the Divine origin of the Bible, which we treat under these three divisions.

I. Its claim.

II. Its manner.

III. Its matter.

I. The Scriptures claim to be the Word of God. The New Testament writers make this claim directly or indirectly, by unequivocal assertion or by implication. They profess to give us not their own gospel but the gospel of the Son of God, who had promised some of them His Spirit "to guide them into all truth," to "bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever He had said unto them," and the power to impart this Holy Spirit to others, their co-laborers, two of whom appear as writers of parts of the New Testament, and are, therefore, to be regarded as making an equal claim with those to whom the promise was first made; while Paul, again and again, directly

and indirectly, professes to teach not his own wisdom but the wisdom of God. The writers of the New Testament also assert that "all Scripture is given by inspiration." They would thus teach that not only is the *New Testament* inspired, but the *Old* as well. They even refer to that as from God, and quote it as infallible. But we have in the Old Testament itself the same claim. Much of it comes with the explicit "thus saith the Lord," while many of the other parts, especially of the Pentateuch, assert the same Divine origin. The Bible as a whole claims, therefore, to be from God. The weight which we are to concede to this claim as evidence must be decided by further investigation. If the writers are proved to be unprincipled men or infatuated, it is worthless, but if they appear to be men of integrity and intelligence, as they do, it is of great weight; of the greatest weight, if the nature of their messages is not inconsistent with such claim.

II. Our second general division, which, for want of a better term, we call the *Manner* of the Bible, we subdivide as follows:

a. Its Unity.

b. Its Mode of developing its theme.

c. Its Style.

a. It is a connected, consistent, perfect whole. It is a unit. This is an important item of proof in establishing its Divine origin. Were this unity wanting, it would be a strong presumption against such origin; it would prove that there was not present an individual pervading Spirit—the same Spirit speaking through the writers—but rather that the writers spake each his own words. It would also prove false its own claim, for Christ professes to have come, "not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil." If, on the other hand, this unity can be established for the Bible, it will readily be perceived to be well nigh conclusive in proof of the Divinity of its origin. Many centuries intervened between the writing of the first sublime sentence of the sacred Word and the closing amen. Many men of marked peculiarities, differing widely in their general character, and their style of writing, living at distant periods of time from each other, and



treating usually each of a separate subject, had part in penning the record. Such, at least, is its profession, and not only is there nothing to disprove the claim, but everything to confirm it. The language, the style, the whole character of the first books, bespeak their antiquity, while the language, style and character of the New Testament books show as plainly their comparatively modern origin. The variety of matter and peculiarities of style, sufficient to prove plurality of writers, are evident to the most careless reader; yet notwithstanding all this, there is clearly manifest a plan; viz., the plan of Redemption. Every part of the record has its place in the development of that plan. Possessing the whole, we can see the fitness of those parts better even than the earlier writers; for they are represented as anxiously inquiring into the significance of their words. The plan received its completion in the work of Christ. Having the history of that work, it is easy to discover how the recorded history of the Jews, as given in the Old Testament, points to Christ. The same may be said of the old Moral and Ceremonial Law, and of the Prophecies. They were types. They prepared the way for Christ, and received their fulfilment in Him, and can now be seen to be essential to the completeness of the work of Redemption. It is not meant, however, that we can decide the precise significance or importance of each passage in its connection with the plan; or even that we can determine that it has any value. Infinite Wisdom alone is competent to that. But we can discover the general connection and bearing, and that is sufficient for our argument. It is enough if we can discover foundation and superstructure, adapted each for the other, and can see the general fitness of part for part, though we may not be able to determine the exact use of every door and window, beam and rafter, open hall and dark recess; enough if we can trace the links of the golden chain which binds together the history, law, prophecies, poetry and philosophy of the Bible. So regular is this plan in its unfolding, that Dr. Jonathan Edwards has written on Redemption in its historic development, and compares it to a house building, "where the workmen are first sent out, then the materials gathered, then the ground fitted,

then the foundation laid, then the superstructure erected, one part after another, until the topstone is laid, and all is finished." There can hardly be a greater absurdity than the supposition that so many writers, living at such wide intervals of time, treating of such topics and in such manner as they have done, should, intentionally or unintentionally, have developed a plan so complete in its unity that it is readily discoverable, and so perfect in its harmony that, while there are no contradictions save those which may be explained satisfactorily by errors in transcription, the coincidences, most of them evidently undisguised, are numberless. Of this last characteristic, and its strength as an argument for the truth of the Bible, we may inform ourselves by a reference to Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, where, by examining the coincidences of two writers of the New Testament, he proves satisfactorily their substantial truthfulness, and thus indirectly the truthfulness of all the rest (for all stand or fall together).

b. We find another evidence of the Divine origin of the Bible in the *gradual manner* in which the plan just noticed was unfolded. This indeed has been urged as disproving such origin. It has been asked, would God have allowed the great majority of the race for so many thousands of years to perish through ignorance of His work for man? Would He not have given a perfect revelation of His plan at the first? However difficult it may be to give a satisfactory answer to such queries, and thus justify the ways of God to men, it is very easy to see a strong analogy between this mode of Revelation and the usual manifestation of Deity in the works of Nature. God in His works never seems to be in a hurry. There is a law of development. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Infancy, childhood, youth, manhood, old age. Millions of years must be spent in preparing the earth for man. Here is a mode of action peculiar to God. The Bible exhibits perfectly this peculiar mode. From the germ of the great Tree of Life which we find in the promise to Adam, to its perfection in Christ's death, we observe this constant but gradual progress. Such a course man would not have taken; it points to God as the author.

c. The Style of the Bible.

Passing objections which have been raised against the Bible, from its peculiarities of style, as too frivolous to require attention, let us notice those characteristics which are of real weight as evidence in favor of our proposition.

And here remark, *First*: The Tone of Authority. This is very striking, and is seen throughout the whole. The Bible comes as the messages of the king to his subjects, the father to his sons, the master to his servants, the Creator to his creatures. Persuasion and argument are indeed often used; but always as incentives to duties authoritatively enjoined; always for man's interest. The *Law* was one of the three divisions of the Old Testament; a law than which none can be conceived more searching, rigid, and inflexible. There is the same feature in the other divisions of the Old Testament, although from their nature not so prominent. Of Christ, also, it is said, that "the people were astonished at his doctrine, for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes." As examples of the tone of authority used by the Apostles, take the following: Paul says, "Though we, though an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." John says, "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Think of the modest, amiable John uttering such words in his own name!

*Second*—The tone of confident assurance. The record of historical events, minute and important biographical sketches of the good and bad, of peasants and princes, prophecies of events impending or remote, respecting individuals or communities, this world or the next, doctrines of man's state, his depravity, the cause, consequences and remedy, of man's relation to his fellows and his Maker, of the character, works and purposes of God, respecting the trivial affairs of common life, and the deep mysteries of God, are given often with

minuteness and in detail, always free from any appearance of doubt or conjecture. The language seems to come from one who knows of what he affirms, not from a pedant or a shrewd guesser. We should have no hesitation in calling those *impostors* who should adopt such a style very short-sighted; and we hesitate not to call that man very short-sighted who supposes that a succession of men who have successfully used this style are impostors.

*Third*—Closely connected with the feature just mentioned, is the simplicity of the language. There is no bombast, no attempt at display. If it is sometimes incomprehensible, it is from the nature of the subject, not from the language. The style may be called strictly *natural*—not scholastic, not scientific, not artificial. In this respect it bears a striking resemblance to the simplicity of Nature.

But it will be asked, Does not each writer have his own style? How then can you speak of the style of the Bible? Each writer does indeed exhibit his own peculiarities to a certain extent; yet there are the points of similarity indicated above, as well as others, which testify to a common author. Unlike other books, we are to look in this for both the human and divine element. The presence of the human does not exclude the divine, since God speaks through man—the men speaking “as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

III. The Matter of the Bible. For the want of space under this head, we shall confine ourselves to the four following particulars:

- a. The Adaptation of Christianity to a felt Want of mankind.
- b. The high tone of Morality inculcated.
- c. The Representation of the Character of God.
- d. The Delineation of the Character of Christ.

a. Christianity is adapted to a universally acknowledged want of the race. There is proof enough of man's depravity outside the Bible. The world's condition to-day is proof. History confirms that proof by the undivided testimony of the ages, while the universal conscience, which is God speaking in us, adds the terrible weight of its authority. Here is an abnormal state, the creature warring against the Creator, the



subject a rebel against the sovereign. The want is pardon, restoration to God's favor, and preservation in that favor ; in a word, Salvation. There is a soul-malady, Sin. There is wanted a remedy. That this want is universally felt is evinced by the universal prevalence of systems of religion, whose object has ever been this—*Salvation*.

We will now give the argument of Thomas Erskine. Admitting the sinfulness of the human heart, that all the woes of man result from this soul malady, the need of some powerful, health-restoring antidote seems most imperious. Therefore, it may justly be regarded as probable that God would meet the necessity and reveal the antidote. Now, when we find such a system of Christianity, which claims a divine origin, which harmonizes with our most enlightened views of God's character, which constantly and consistently presents the only rational view of man's nature as depraved, and which is adapted to man's capacities, tending most distinctly to the eradication of this malady, the probability becomes an assurance that this is God's system. Christianity has this tendency by presenting to us a most interesting series of actions, in which God's moral character, as far as we are concerned, is fully and perspicuously embodied, in which the most condescending and affecting and entreating kindness is so wonderfully combined with the most spotless holiness, while the natural appeals which emanate from every part of it to our esteem, gratitude, shame, and interest, are so urgent and constraining, that he who carries about with him a conviction of the truth and reality of this history, possesses in it a principle of mighty efficiency, which must subdue and harmonize his mind to the will of that Great Being whose character is thus depicted. The object of a true religion must be, from the nature of the mind, not only to instruct us in the principle of the government of God, but also to beget in us that resemblance to Him, our moral Governor, with which our highest happiness is exclusively connected. Natural religion cannot effect this, since it is a mere system of abstract principles, and abstract principles do not move the mind. Christianity, and no religion but Christianity, does effect this. Chris-

tianity, therefore, by this feature commends itself to us as being from God. Such, in brief, is Erskine's argument.

Of the many specific characteristics of the Bible which would legitimately fall under the head of adaptation, we select only one for more extended consideration; viz.: The *Universality of its teachings*. It professes to be a book for the race. There is no limitation of rank, condition, country, or time. Originating at the time, or rather the times, in which it did, and among a single people, it is incredible that uninspired men, trained in those ages and among that people, could have invented a system of religion perfectly adapted in its principles and modes of teaching them, to all ages and countries, and could have presented it freed from all stain of political, local, or sectarian prejudices, and unimpeachable in any age, with the charge of endorsing or accrediting one of the countless known scientific errors of the times in which it was written. Such, however, is the religion of the Bible properly and fairly interpreted. The world is challenged to produce another instance of the kind. A slight examination of Greek and Latin mythology, of the Koran, or of the religious books of the Chinese, will suffice. They cannot bear the slightest test on any possible construction. Yet the Bible, under the most searching criticism, only asks for fairness of interpretation, and it stands the test.

(b.) Our next evidence we find in the high tone of morality inculcated. With a clear insight into the human heart, pronouncing that to be the spring of action, its commands stop not with outward compliance, but enjoin perfect holiness of heart. It seeks to make clean the *inside* of the cup and platter. Its standard is perfection. A sinful creature would have found it impossible, without the Divine Spirit, to conceive of such a standard of morals, and even were it *possible* for him to conceive of it, it is in the highest degree *improbable* that he should enjoin, as a rule of duty, that which would inevitably *condemn* all—himself with others. Again, had men invented an expedient by which they would have sin pardoned, most likely they would have conceded some license in sin, by reason of that pardon. Such a course would have been natural.

The Bible, however, still presses the duty of perfect obedience; still insists on perfect holiness, even increases the penalty of disobedience: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he is sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace." "If ye love me, keep my commandments." And then the perfect simplicity, and reasonableness, and comprehensiveness of the two principles on which all this depends, bears the impress of God. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself." "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

*c. The Scripture Representation of God's Character.*

It was stated at the outset that the subject assumes some knowledge of God's character from sources independent of the Bible. How much knowledge could thus be obtained? If as much, and as certain knowledge as can be obtained from the Bible, if true, then the truthfulness of the Scripture representations of that character would form no conclusive proof that it was from God, since we might suppose the writers to be philosophers of sufficient wisdom to have deduced their theology from nature, and without revelation. If, however, the Scriptures teach us the character of God far more fully and plainly than we could possibly have learned it from nature, and the Scripture representation not only corresponds with nature's teachings, but explains satisfactorily many questions which could not be answered without a revelation, we derive a very tangible and cogent argument in favor of its Divine origin.

Let us suppose the first hypothesis true, and observe some conclusions to which we are brought. Christian theology would indeed be true, but would be drawn from sources within the reach of all, viz.: the human spirit and external nature. In that case it would be placed on the same level with any other natural science. The theologians who followed the writers of the Bible would use their writings only as aids to

the acquisition of further knowledge from the same source. As the result of such labors, the Bible would soon become obsolete as a text book, and a more modern work take its place, and we should no more use the writings of Moses as a text book in theology, than the works of his Egyptian cotemporaries as text books in Astronomy. We should, on such hypothesis, have the strange phenomenon of a natural science, the most interesting of all, and which has elicited more thought and investigation than any other, nay, than all others, not only making no advance in the ages, but actually retrograding.

Again, those nations which have not the Bible, if we suppose them to have equal natural ability with those which do possess it, and to have had this equal ability in the ages past, would possess as correct and rational views of God as those which have the Scriptures. This would certainly be a fair inference, if they can be shown to have given as much attention to theology as the others, and no one will deny that they have. Does this conclusion tally with the known facts of heathen religions?

These, and like these, are the absurd conclusions to which our first hypothesis forces us.

Let us turn to the second. The Bible says, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." The Bible doctrine, then, is, *God, the Creator*. It thus solves a problem which had involved philosophers in endless, hopeless perplexity, and it does it in a single sentence—its first. Reasoning from nature, men could come to no certain knowledge respecting this. The fact asserted, everything tallies with it; we consent to it as true. The *how* is unexplained, but that does not disturb us, for it is *reasonable* that it should be unexplained. The Scriptures teach that God is *one*, yet *omnipresent*. That frees us from the wretched system of *Polytheism*. Before, we could not unite these ideas, so apparently contradictory; could not conceive of a being whose mode of existence is so different from ours. The doctrine stated, everything so conforms to this view, that, though the *how* is still inconceivable, we feel that the solution is correct, it is reasonable. The God of the Bible is infinitely *Holy* and *Just*, yet infinitely *Merciful*.



These attributes are prominently presented, as of most vital interest to man. In the plan of redemption they are exhibited in the strongest light. Acknowledge the truth of that, and we see how "God can be Just, and the Justifier of him who believeth on Christ." There is no appearance of absurdity; the work seems sufficient and perfect, and to harmonize with an elevated view of God, and a correct view of man. Turn to a system of natural religion, or any of the religions of heathen nations, and mark the contrast. Who could be long in deciding where truth lies?

d. The Delineation of the Character of Christ. The writers of the New Testament bring before us one whom they assert to be at the same time a perfect man and God, no god of heathen mythology, with the passions, foibles, weaknesses of men, but the God of the Bible, Creator, Upholder, Disposer of all things, a Being of infinite perfections—no drunken Bacchus, thieving Mercury, or uxorious Jupiter, but the great I AM, the Jehovah. This God-man appears in varied and trying positions, with the rich, the poor, the learned, the unlearned; with friends and foes, in private, in public, with hypocrites, scribes, pharisees, publicans, and sinners, in city and country; now wearied and worn, now active and vigorous, now the people's idol, now their scorn; on the mount of transfiguration, on the cross; questioned, tried, tempted by learned lawyers, by insidious, malignant foes, ay, by the *Devil* himself, and everywhere He is made to speak out plainly, directly, and often at length upon the common affairs of life and the deep mysteries of God and eternity, yet never do we find His words or actions belie this two-fold character. There is always the perfect man, always the God. Says Dr. Channing, "We observe in Jesus Christ an unparalleled dignity of character and consciousness of greatness, never discovered or approached by any other individual in history, and yet there was blended with it a condescension, loveliness, and unostentatious simplicity which had never before been thought consistent with greatness. In like manner he united an utter superiority to the world, its pleasures and ordinary interests, with suavity of manners, and freedom from austerity. He

joined strong feelings and self-possession, an indignant sensibility to sin, and compassion to the sinner, an intense devotion to his work, and calmness under opposition and ill success, a universal philanthropy and susceptibility to private attachment, the authority which became the Saviour of the world, and the tenderness and gratitude of a son." Such and more, was Christ, yet there are those who would have us believe that this is a mere fancy sketch drawn by fishermen! Who can reply to such men?

We think the claim of the Bible established by the evidence which may be drawn from its unity, its mode of developing its theme, its adaptation to meet the felt wants of mankind, its exalted standard of morality, its representation of God's character, and its delineation of such a character as Christ. We think if the eminent Greek professor who has discussed the mooted Homeric question, is justified in asserting, mainly from internal evidence, that "Homer wrote the 'Iliad,' the whole 'Iliad,' and the 'Iliad' as a whole, and Homer also wrote the 'Odyssey,'" we with equal reason may say, *God* is the author of the *Old Testament*, the author of the *whole* Old Testament and the Old Testament *as* a whole, and *God* is also the author of the *New Testament*.

---

#### ART. V.—NINEVEH: THE HISTORIANS AND THE MONUMENTS.\*

WE do not propose formally to review the works mentioned at the head of our article, but simply to make them a starting point for the discussion of a theme to which one of them is incidentally, the other entirely devoted. The elaborate work of Rawlinson, of which the third volume has recently

---

\* Ueber den historischen Gewinn aus der Entzifferung der assyrischen Inschriften, von Johannes Brandis. Berlin, 1956.

Rawlinson's Herodotus, in four volumes. Vol. I. London, 1858.

appeared, we hope on its completion to review in extenso. It is interesting both to the general and to the Christian scholar, partly from the results actually arrived at, partly as foreshadowing the altered aspects which our knowledge of antiquity will assume when the hieroglyphics of Egypt, the arrow-headed inscriptions of Persia, and the exhumed monuments of Nineveh, shall be made to utter an articulate and perfectly intelligible testimony. It is impossible to conjecture what vast lacunæ of ancient history—spaces that have stretched as void and desolate across the track of history as the interior of Africa on our maps—may yet be filled up with royal dynasties, and with military and political achievements. We are indeed as yet very far from any such consummation, and it may be questioned whether in the comparatively crude and infantile state of these researches, a work of so large a compass and so high pretension as that of Mr. Rawlinson may not justly be regarded as premature. The seventh essay of the first volume is devoted to an attempt to reconstruct the chronology and history of the Assyrian empire. The pamphlet of Mr. Brandis (who had also previously distinguished himself by some acute investigations in the same direction) gives a brief survey of the historical testimony regarding Nineveh, and then of the manner in which that testimony is affected by the disclosures of the monuments. We propose to follow partly in the same track, and from the works before us (more especially that of Brandis) and other sources, to endeavor to clear up some of the confused and contradictory problems of Assyrian history. We begin with some slight topographical details.

He who sails down the Tigris from Upper Kurdistan toward Mosul and Bagdad, after emerging from the narrow gorges of the southern chain of Taurus, sees at Jerizeh a wide plain opening before him. On the left, indeed, the stream still washes the base of the mountain, and soon after strikes the foot of the spurs of Jebel Zakkho, which, however, retreats gradually from the river, until at Mosul it lies off about five caravan hours to the east. Immediately opposite Mosul he sees on the eastern bank two hills, between which winds the

small river Kausar. On the northern hill, about 45 feet high and 7,800 in circuit, and greatly surpassing the other in both extent and depth, stands the village of Koyunjik, and on the other, called from its being the reputed site of the grave of the prophet Jonah, Nebbi Yunus, the village of Ninuah. Some fourteen miles northeast of Mosul lies on a like mound the village of Korsabad; and nearly eighteen miles directly south, just above the confluence of the great Zab, the ancient Lycus, with the Tigris, rises a pyramidal hill, overlooking a terraced plateau on which is the village of Nimroud. These four points, lying nearly in a direct line from north to south, Korsabad, Koyunjik, Nebbi Yunus, and Nimroud, are the principal sites at which recent excavations have brought to light the palaces and temples of the great Assyrian capital. The city stretched along the eastern shore of the river, in the form probably of an irregular parallelogram. Its dimensions, given at 480 stadia, or 60 English miles, in circuit, are more likely to be under than over stated. Korsabad was perhaps the seat of a large suburban palace and town, reared like the villa of Hadrian, or the structures of Versailles and St. Cloud, to gratify the munificent tastes of Assyrian sovereigns; while Koyunjik and Nimroud may have been encircled within one vast enclosure. The career of discovery was opened by M. Botta in 1843, by the exploring of the palace of Sargon at Korsabad. Layard commenced in 1845 the disinterment of the vast palace of Sennacherib at Koyunjik, and about the same period proceeded to draw forth at Nimroud the ruins of four palaces, the earliest and the latest structures of Assyrian royalty. The oldest of these, that occupying the northwest corner of the terrace, was in ruins when Nineveh was captured, and had furnished material for subsequent palaces in its neighborhood. This alone bears no marks of that fiery deluge that swept over its sister structures in the last grand catastrophe. This remarkable pyramid of Nimroud and the ruinous fortresses of Koyunjik, attracted the attention of Xenophon, who passed them with his Ten Thousand without dreaming of the surging life and imperial splendors which scarcely two centuries earlier had revelled in these seats of desolation.



These brilliant discoveries could not but kindle a fresh interest in the fortunes of those mighty empires, which, in the gray dawn of human history, planted their seats on the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris. Babylon and Nineveh loom up before our imagination indistinct, shadowy, terrible, as the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, now emerging into the substantial majesty of real power, then retreating behind their veil of cloud, at once challenging and mocking our curiosity, and seeming rather gigantic phantoms, shaped out of the mists of a hoary tradition, than a part of the real flesh and blood kingdoms whose successive rise and fall have made up the drama of authentic history. It has been reserved to be the triumph of our day to dissipate in part the shadows that have flitted over these wide realms of empire, to unsepulchre the long buried monuments of their greatness, and to spell out that mysterious record of their achievements which was traced by the order, and under the eye, of their hero monarchs. By a remarkable coincidence, in which only a purblind skepticism can refuse to recognize a Providence, these magnificent remains were brought to light just as the all-conquering methods of comparative philology had mastered the obscurities of the Persian arrow-headed writing, and thus placed it in a position, through the tri-lingual inscriptions by which the Persian monarchs reached all the great classes of population in their empire, to grapple with the far more complicated and abstruse alphabets of Babylon and Assyria. Thus at one and the same moment the munificence and enterprise of Europe were crowding the museums of London and Paris with the gigantic creations of Assyrian art, and the skill and industry of European scholars were deciphering its enigmatical characters, and carrying the torch of their discoveries into the dark chambers of its history. True, the sanguine hopes of those who expected to leap with a bound into the inmost heart of Assyrian antiquity—to resolve at once its numberless difficulties—have been doomed to inevitable disappointment. And in the repeated baffling of oft-repeated endeavor, in the sudden snapping of many a fancied clue of discovery, some have become at times skeptical in regard to well-authenticated results, and

despaired of any adequate aid from the monuments in unravelling the intricacies of Assyrian history. Yet these persons have not sufficiently considered the magnitude of the problems, nor the slow and baffling processes that have attended all the great achievements of science—the dreary wanderings and the desert sojourn which always precede the promised land. On the whole, all has been accomplished which lay within the scope of rational expectation, and enough to justify the hope of a far more complete success. To sum up in full the results thus far attained is not our present purpose—an attempt, even for those best qualified, doubtless premature. Our object is much humbler. We propose rather to survey (with Brandis' tract as our general guide) our principal sources of Assyrian history, and the state of the historical question independently of the monuments, and then to indicate by a few specimens the way in which these latter have affected the historical evidence. To the student of Assyrian history the first question is, what are the sources and extent of our previous knowledge of that history? and then, how far has this been confirmed, contradicted, or enlarged by the exhumed monuments and inscriptions? If we can aid in disentangling a subject which lies in the general mind in great confusion, and in showing that the bricks of Babylon and the sculptured slabs of Nineveh promise yet to be built up into a structure of historical knowledge which no material convulsion can overthrow, our purpose will be accomplished. We shall summon, therefore, to the stand the several witnesses whose testimony may be regarded as having an independent value.

We must pay our tribute in this, as in almost every question of antiquarian research, to the restless curiosity and the comprehensive literature of Greece. Greece early, no doubt, and in many ways, through commerce, war, and travel, came into contact with Assyria. But her prose records scarcely begun until a century after Nineveh had been laid in ashes, and when the former greatness of the empire lived only in tradition. Our first Greek witness, whose spirit and opportunities of research entitle him to a hearing, is the fable-loving, and still more eminently, the truth-loving Herodotus. Born in B.

C. 484, Herodotus wrote somewhat after the middle of the fifth century before Christ. He visited Babylon, which he beheld with admiring wonder, and as the result of his personal observations and of his researches in the Babylonian archives, wrote or planned a special history of Assyria and Babylon. The notices regarding Assyria in his extant work, are extremely brief. Their substance is, that Assyria held the dominion of Upper Asia for 520 years, when her power was weakened by the defection, first of the Medes and soon after of her other dependencies; that, after a period of anarchy, whose length is not defined, Deioces obtained the sovereignty of the Medes in—as a sure reckoning fixes the date—709; that, after a reign of 53 years, he was succeeded by his son Phraortes, who reduced the revolted provinces of Assyria to the Median sway, but was defeated in an attack on Nineveh, and perished with nearly all his army. His son Cyaxares succeeded to the throne in 634. He renewed the attack on Nineveh, but the siege was suspended by an irruption of the Scythians, who held Asia in servitude during 28 years. At the end of this time Cyaxares shook off the Assyrian yoke, recovered his former possessions, and laid siege to and captured Nineveh, though how, or under what Assyrian monarch, Herodotus does not inform us. The date of this event must be fixed, according to Herodotus, at about 606 B. C. It could not have been earlier, as the twenty-eight years of the Scythian dominion come down to this point. It could scarcely have been later, as Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, was, as we learn from Berosus, Cyaxares' confederate in arms, and he died in 604, and in 605 he yielded up to his son Nebuchadnezzar the command of the army. It is safe, then, for us to fix Herodotus' date for the destruction of Nineveh at 606 before Christ.

But when commenced this 520 years of Assyrian supremacy? This remains somewhat uncertain, as Herodotus does not give the interval which elapsed between the revolt of the Medes and the accession of Deioces in 709. It must have commenced certainly more than 520 years before 709, *i. e.*, earlier than 1229, and somewhere probably in the thirteenth century before Christ. But we may approximate the date



more nearly. The Heraclid dynasty of Lydia Herodotus makes to commence with Agron, son of Ninus, in 1221. The Ninus here mentioned is beyond question the Ninus to whom tradition ascribed the founding of the Assyrian empire, and as Herodotus followed this tradition, he also probably followed the current tradition regarding the length of Ninus' reign. This was 52 years, which, assuming that Agron came to the throne of Lydia on the death of his father, would place the commencement of the Assyrian sovereignty at 1273.

This reckoning would fix the Median revolt (the close of that period of 524 years) in 753, and leave an interval of 44 years between this and the accession of Deioces. Without vouching for the perfect exactness of these dates, we may be justified in fixing the commencement of the Assyrian rule in Upper Asia early in the thirteenth century, and its decline about the middle of the eighth. The leading points, then, of the deposition of Herodotus, are, that Assyria swayed the empire of Upper Asia for 524 years, from the early part of the thirteenth ante-Christian century to nearly the middle of the eighth; that her dominion was then broken, first, by the falling off of the Medes, and then of other subject provinces; that she nevertheless still remained powerful, as she nearly a century afterward routed and destroyed the army of the Median prince; but finally sunk under the Median arms in about 606, when the supremacy of Asia was divided between Media and Babylon.

We here dismiss the Halicarnassian, and call, as our next Greek authority, Ctesias to the stand. He was a native of Cnidos in Caria, and spent seventeen years at the court of Persia, as private physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, and healed the wound which that prince received from his brother, the younger Cyrus, at the battle of Cunaxa. He returned to his country in 398; he must thus have written early in the fourth century, and been a younger contemporary of Herodotus. His long residence and high position at the Persian court, gave him access, it would seem, to the Persian archives, whence he drew, he says, the materials for an extensive history of Persia, comprised in 23 books, written for the express



purpose of correcting the notions of the Greeks, regarding the Oriental nations, and especially of exposing the flagrant misrepresentations of Herodotus. The first six books were devoted to the history of Assyria. The entire work has perished, except a meagre abridgment by Photius, and of the Assyrian portion we have only a few fragments contained in Diodorus Siculus, Athenæus, Plutarch, &c. Otherwise, we take them all at second-hand, from writers who follow him as authority in Assyrian history.

Ctesias differs in Assyrian matters widely from Herodotus. According to him, Ninus, more than 2000 years before Christ, first established in Asia a vast empire, subjugating all the nations from the Persian gulf to the Hellespont, and from the Indus to the Nile, and built, as a fitting capital to his empire, the city of Nineveh. His queen and successor, Semiramis, aided his exploits while he lived, and emulated them after his death, rearing in various places immense monuments of her power, and founding on the Euphrates the city of Babylon. The deeds of Ninus and Semiramis are given in detail from Ctesias in the second book of Diodorus. They are succeeded by a series of thirty kings, who, with the exception perhaps of a single break in the dynasty, transmit the sceptre continuously from father to son through a period of 1306 years. This long line of monarchs display, according to Ctesias, none of the qualities of the two great founders of their empire. Effeminate and voluptuous, they shut themselves up in their palaces, rioting in unbounded profligacy, while a standing army of 400,000 men guarded their vast frontier. Sardanapalus, the last of this infamous succession, surpassed all his predecessors in effeminacy and debauchery, wearing the garb of a woman, and displaying his talent only in inventing new forms of sensuality. A combination of his Median and Babylonian vassals, however, being formed against him, he suddenly rouses himself from his dissolute inaction, exchanges his woman's garb for the helmet and brand of the warrior, during three years of fierce and desperate resistance, repeatedly routs his adversaries in the open field, and at length, when overwhelmed by numbers, seeks a

voluntary death in the flames of his palace, fired by his own hand. Arbaces assumes the government, lays the city in ruins, and transfers the seat of empire to Media. This catastrophe occurred about 880 B. C., nearly 300 years earlier than the date assigned to it by Herodotus.

The intrinsic improbabilities of this narrative are glaring and manifold. That a long series of sovereigns should have followed each other through thirteen centuries with scarcely a break in the succession; that such a series of worthless and profligate *fainéants* should, through this long period, have maintained in its integrity a vast empire, won by the valor and ability of their single great ancestor; that, finally, the most dissolute of them all, steeped to the lips in revelling and debauchery, should suddenly rouse himself to deeds of heroic valor, and die sublimely with his burning palace for his funeral pyre;—all this bears too incontestably the stamp of romance to command the satisfied belief of a sober man.

Yet the high claims and great advantages of Ctesias caused this picture, equally revolting and incredible, to be transferred in its main features to the pages of later historians. Diodorus, Justin, Nicolaus Damascenus, Cephalion, Eusebius, Syncellus, followed in the main his accounts, though variously blending them with outside traditions and hypotheses. All take for granted his early date for the destruction of Nineveh, while his period of 1306 years (which carries the origin of the empire back to 2186 B. C.) they abridge or expand to meet the exigencies of their various chronological systems. Eusebius reduces it to 1240; Cephalion to 1033; while Syncellus raises it to 1460 years, and all lengthening, shortening, omitting, and interpolating reigns in the most arbitrary manner. All take for granted its grand outline, according to which the great Assyrian Empire is founded not far from 2000 years B. C., runs through a course of some 1200 years under a line of indolent and profligate princes, and is at length dissolved and its capital laid in ashes early in the ninth century, nearly 300 years before the date assigned to that event by Herodotus.

The annals of Egypt shed but a scanty light on Assyrian history. They exhibit, according to Manetho, Assyria as a formidable power even in the time of the Hyksos, 2500 years B. C., while from the seventeenth to the thirteenth centuries it appears again inconsiderable, as we find Egyptian monarchs during this period carrying their triumphant arms even into Mesopotamia.

We turn next to the Hebrew Scriptures, one of our most valuable sources of knowledge regarding Assyrian history. The Israelites, with their Syrian and Phœnician neighbors, were for a time brought by their position into close relations with Assyria. We meet first, in the book of Genesis, the statement—expressly contradictory to that of Ctesias—that Babylon was the older city, and that thence Nineveh was founded. Centuries then elapse before the Assyrians appear on the scene of Scripture history, when at length they are brought up by God to chastise the rebellious monarchs of Israel and Judah. Early in the eighth century commences a series of expeditions of powerful Assyrian monarchs directed against Palestine, in common with Egypt and Phœnicia. First appears Phul or Pul, who, before the year 769, wrung from Menahem, king of Israel, a thousand talents in tribute. Next, between the years 757 and 738, Tiglath Pilassar makes a still more formidable invasion between the reigns of Pekah and Ahaz, carrying captive to Assyria a part of the people of Israel, and breaking up the kingdom of Damascus. Some twenty-five years after, in 729, Salmanassar marched against Hoshea, king of Israel, and rendered him tributary; but finding him treacherous, threw him into chains. In a second expedition he captured Samaria, after a siege of three years, carried away the people captive, and dispersed them in Media and elsewhere, replacing them by colonists from different parts of his own empire. From 2 Kings, xvii. 24, it appears that Salmanassar included Phœnicia in his expedition, and the war is sketched by Josephus (*Ant.* ix. 14), in an extract of some length from the Ephesian historian Menander. It recounts an expedition made or sent by Salmanassar to Cittium in Cyprus, apparently in con-

nection with his reduction of the revolted towns of Phœnicia. Six years after, in 713, Judea was invaded by Sennacherib, its cities captured, and a large tribute wrung from Hezekiah. It was probably in a second expedition that Sennacherib sent an immense division of his force against Jerusalem, the bravadoing of whose generals presents a striking picture of Assyrian insolence, and whose miraculous destruction is attested even by the distorted story of Herodotus. Sennacherib was succeeded on the throne of Assyria by his son Esarhaddon, who, pursuing the warlike career of his predecessor, seems to have planted additional colonies in Samaria, and to have carried to Babylon Manasseh king of Judah. Assyria here disappears from the Hebrew annals, and Babylon takes its place as the enemy of the people of God. In Isaiah xx., we have, however, an Assyrian king, Sargon, mentioned in connection with wars against Ashdod and Egypt. He has been conjecturally identified with Salmanassar, with what probability we shall see by-and-by.

A glance discloses the bearing of these Scripture accounts upon the narrative of Ctesias. As early as 876, according to Ctesias, Nineveh was laid in ashes. A long series of dissolute do-nothings had revelled in her banqueting halls, and fondled concubines in her seraglios, until at last the most dissolute of the train achieves prodigies of desperate valor, and finds an august sepulchre in the ashes of his capital. And this, according to Ctesias, is the end of Assyria. No trace of a resurrection appears on his pages; the sceptre has passed from her apparently forever. And yet, a century later, in 769, the Bible brings upon the stage a succession of Assyrian princes, warlike, enterprising, insolent, in the full flush of power and conquest, dashing to pieces the gods and thrones of the nations, asserting their dominion over Babylon, Media, Palestine, Syria, Phœnicia, and Egypt, and extending down to within a short period of the time assigned by Herodotus to the destruction of the city. It would seem that those who regarded one of these pictures as true, would necessarily hold the other to be false; that the Assyria of Ctesias, and the Assyria of Kings and Chronicles, were too widely discrepant



for any reasonable endeavor to bring them into harmony; especially as the glimpses opened by Scripture are in accordance with the acknowledged greatness of the Assyrian empire, while the pretentious statements of Ctesias are intrinsically absurd. Still the harmonizing process was attempted. The Assyria of Scripture was married on to the Assyria of Ctesias. Both conquests were therefore admitted, that of Ctesias and that of Herodotus, and a double Assyrian empire was assumed, the one closing early in the ninth century, the other near the end of the seventh. And as both the destructions were effected by a Medo-Babylonian confederacy, and as it was in fact evident that both catastrophes referred to the same event, they have been by a curious confusion at once identified and separated. Hence, two Assyrian empires, two Medo-Babylonian confederacies, two Sardana-paluses, each perishing in the flames of his palace; one mighty empire lasting through more than a millenium yet headed by drivellers and profligates; and another brief one ruled by men whose martial prowess was worthy of a great monarchy—such are the palpable incongruities wrought into the prevalent renderings of Assyrian history. Judicious criticism will determine where lies the balance of probability; it will find reason, in the utterly unhistorical character of the 1300 years' dynasty of Ctesias, to discard his early date for the overthrow of Assyria.

But let us see what further light the Scripture sheds upon Herodotus' date of 606. At Kings, xxiii. 29, a king of Assyria is mentioned, against whom Pharaoh Necho marches at the close of the reign of Josiah. This was in 609. Moreover, Zephaniah, who prophesied in this reign, speaks of the destruction of Nineveh as yet future: "He will destroy Assyria, and make Nineveh a desolation." But a prophecy of Jeremiah, written in the first year of the captivity, 605, leads us to infer that Nineveh was no longer existing, as in an extended enumeration (xxv. 18-26) of the kings and nations that were to drink the cup of divine wrath, Assyria and its capital are not mentioned. Thus the accuracy of Herodotus again receives striking confirmation.

Still, the only discrepancy between Ctesias and Scripture, which is absolutely irreconcilable, is the moral one. It lies in their different showing of the character of the two empires, rather than in any *necessary* chronological contradiction, for although Ctesias (taking Diodorus as his expounder) certainly leaves the impression that the catastrophe which he records was final and irretrievable; he does not expressly say so. Nineveh may possibly have risen from her ashes, run the career assigned to her in Scripture, and perished in the manner indicated by Herodotus, and at the time fixed by their joint testimony. But directly across the track of this assumed first overthrow and resurrection, lies the 524 years' supremacy of Herodotus, which knows no such catastrophe, and makes Assyria flourishing and potent when, according to Ctesias, her provinces were portioned between Media and Babylon, and her capital was a smouldering mass of ruin. The question now arises, what weight shall be given to this statement of Herodotus of the 524 years of Assyrian domination in Asia? Whence did Herodotus derive it? Was it an unsupported conjecture, or, as the definiteness of the statement implies, did he draw it from some reliable document? Let this be substantiated, and the last fragment of Ctesias chronology is shattered, and we discard alike his early date of the origin, and of the final catastrophe of the empire. Thus stood the matter, seemingly incapable of an adequate solution, when one of those interesting disclosures which are crowding our eventful age, threw upon it an unexpected light.

This was the discovery of the first half of the chronological work of Eusebius. The second half, comprising exclusively chronological tables, already existed in the Latin translation of Jerome. The first part, in which Eusebius had brought together important extracts from Manetho and Berosus, was known only by a few fragments contained in Syncellus, Cedrinus, etc., until, near the close of the last century, the whole work was found at Constantinople in an Armenian translation, and turned, by the sagacity of Niebuhr, to the illustration of ancient history.

The general diffusion of Greek culture which followed on

the Macedonian conquest led the learned men of different nations to draw up in the Greek language, for the information of the Greeks, accounts of the origin and fortunes of their respective countries. The most important of these were the histories of Egypt and Babylon, the former by Manetho, a priest of lower Egypt, and the latter by Berosus, a priest of Chaldea. Their works are lost, except fragments existing in Josephus, Eusebius, and others. That of Berosus was divided into two books, of which the former treated of the cosmogonical traditions of the Chaldeans, and the latter contained an account, drawn from the Babylonian archives, of all the Babylonian dynasties, both mythical and historical, both ante and post-diluvian. The earliest, that is, the mythical, series of kings was known from Syncellus. The last portion of the list (or one very similar) from 747, the epoch of Nabonassar, was preserved in the canon of Ptolemy. But the important intermediate dynasties, together with some historical notices respecting the later kings, were first supplied by the Armenian Eusebius. Berosus, agreeing with Scripture, makes Babylon older than Nineveh. His succession of dynasties ruling in Babylon bears the impress of probability, as it shows Babylon often in the hands of alien kings, and the fertile plains of Mesopotamia inviting invasion alike from the mountainous east and the desert regions of the south. Thus, with the dawn of the historic era, we find a Median dynasty of eight kings ruling over Babylon; then a nameless dynasty of eleven kings; then a Chaldean one of forty-nine kings; then an Arabian one of nine kings. Semiramis then comes upon the stage, and after her follows a dynasty of forty-five Assyrian kings, which ruled 526 years, and, as the chronology shows, from about 1273, B. C., to 747, the epoch of Nabonassar. In this 526 years Niebuhr detected the 520 years of Herodotus. It becomes, then, almost certain that Herodotus drew his statement from Babylonian authorities, and, in all probability, adjusted to it his Lydian and Median chronology. His 520 may have been merely a round number for 526, or it may be explained by the revolt of the Medes from Assyria preceding, by some six years, that of the Babylonians. Of a destruction

of Nineveh in the ninth century Berosus is entirely silent. Sardanapalus he places after Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, and under his son, Saracus, Nineveh is represented as destroyed by the combined forces of Media and Babylon, and Saracus as perishing in the flames of his own palace. The catastrophe recorded by Berosus is manifestly the same with that of Ctesias, but antedated by the latter nearly three centuries, probably to gratify Medo-Persian vanity, by ascribing some hundreds of additional years to their empire. Yet unreliable as Ctesias proves himself, Niebuhr and Rawlinson probably go too far in denouncing him as a sheer impostor, and his list of kings as a wholesale fabrication. His accounts of Ninus and Semiramis, of Sardanapalus and his overthrow, though bidding defiance to all just chronology, probably followed current tradition, and are not without many grains of truth. The evidence warrants us, however, in bringing down the epoch of Assyrian domination from the cloudy antiquity of the third ante-Christian millenium to the comparative recentness of the thirteenth century; and as the epoch of Nabonassar may be fairly presumed to coincide with that of Babylonian independence, there seem good grounds for dating the falling off of Babylon from Assyrian sway at 747, and consequently the commencement of that sway at 1273.

Before summing up the results of our inquiry, we may remark, in passing, upon a formidable inroad made into the entire domain of early Assyrian history. Following in the wake of Niebuhr's Roman speculations, K. O. Müller directed his keen and practised eye to the story of Sardanapalus. Movers applied the same principles to that of Ninus and Semiramis, and, under the wand of these critical enchanter, the whole historical pageant dissolved into myth and legend, and the solid forms of Assyrian royalty melted into the phantom divinities of Assyrian worship. Sardanapalus was but an incarnation of Sardon, the Assyrio-Persian war-god; Semiramis was but another name for Tanais, or Astarte, whose worship, in connection with that of Sardon, was co-extensive with the Assyrian sway; and out of the combination of power and effeminacy which the Oriental ideas associated with these



gods sprung the contrasted characteristics of the Assyrian monarchs, culminating in the thrice dissolute life, and thrice heroic death, of the last member of the dynasty, who thus stood forth at once the grand representative of Assyrian royalty, and the grand embodiment of Assyrian superstition. Ninus and Ninyas, under the critical handling, were mere impersonations of the city, like the personal designations under which the Greeks embodied their conceptions of a tribe. Criticism like this, however, could never, in judicious hands, be carried far, for its utmost results are but negative and conjectural. All its premises regarding the identity of the human names with those of divinities might be sound, and yet all its conclusions might be false. Whether a given personage existed at a given time, is a question resting on evidence wholly independent of the significance of his name, inasmuch as nearly all proper names were originally significant, and it would accord eminently with the Oriental spirit to derive its designations of royalty from the gods.

Apart, therefore, from these speculations, the following are the general results to which a comparison of testimony might lead us prior to the explorations: That Babylon was anterior to Nineveh, and probably rose earlier (as she did later) to power, and that hence it was probably Babylon, rather than Nineveh, that was formidable to the Hyksos 2,500 years before Christ; that Nineveh existed with varying fortunes, but never emerged into the position of a ruling power, until in the thirteenth century, when, under a queen Semiramis, and perhaps with a change of dynasty, she became the ruling power in Asia, compelling Babylon, Media, Armenia, Lydia, and Bactria to submit to her arms, and extending her victorious march even to Egypt and India. For 520 years this sway remained substantially unbroken, though doubtless with fluctuating limits. The warlike achievements of King David must certainly have forced it back upon the west. Near the middle of the eighth century commenced a great, but still very gradual revolution. In 753 the Medes took the lead in throwing off the Assyrian yoke, and were followed soon after by Babylon and other provinces. Still Assyria, though weak-

ened, remained for more than a century the mightiest power in Asia. She partially reasserted her dominion over the Medes; pushed her conquests on the lower Tigris and the Euphrates; compelled Babylon into re-subjection to her kings and viceroys; compensated for partial losses in the east by conquests in Phœnicia, Palestine, and Egypt; and under a succession of able princes, kept in subjection and terror the countries between the Euphrates and the Nile. Pul, Tiglath Pilassar, Salmanassar, Sennacharib, and Esarhaddon, probably kept up the empire to its proudest pitch of greatness. The Median revolt is connected by Josephus (and after him by historians generally) with the terrible overthrow of Sennacherib. The chronology, however, does not favor this, the defeat of Sennacherib happening not earlier than 713; and important as was that event to the Jews, it is by no means certain that it affected decisively the great empire of Assyria. Esarhaddon, at all events, pursued the conquering career of his predecessors; yet the Median power was gaining strength, and Assyria hastened to her decline. The Mede Phraortes began to extend his dominion over Asia, but his attacks on Nineveh were successfully resisted, possibly by Sardanapalus, the last but one of the Assyrian dynasty. Under his successor, Saracus, Cyaxares assailed Nineveh, and, after an interval of twenty-eight years occasioned by the Scythian invasion, leagued himself with Nabopolassar, the Assyrian viceroy of Babylon, and their united power succeeded, after a desperate resistance, in 606, in capturing the capital, and crushing forever the Assyrian monarchy.

This, it must be confessed, is but a meagre memorial of an empire that filled antiquity with its renown, and during nearly seven centuries held the acknowledged sovereignty of the world. During the long interval from 1273 down to 770, the time of Phul, there is not, with the exception, perhaps, of Semiramis, a single name supplied, either by profane or sacred history, as the dynasty of Ctesias is too ignorantly or recklessly constructed to be entitled to the slightest credit. In the later period, again, where the Scriptures, Berosus, and the canon of Ptolemy, come to our aid, still in no case is Assyrian

history the primary aim ; and in the last three or four reigns, especially, Assyrian and Babylonian affairs are too thoroughly complicated to admit of any adequate disentanglement. In this stage of the question we are suddenly confronted by a new class of witnesses, and we eagerly turn to them to see how far they will relieve or deepen our perplexities. We cannot now dwell on the manner in which their deposition has been obtained ; on the marvellous blending of industry, sagacity, and scientific method by which the mysteriously inscribed rock has been tortured into living utterance, and compelled to add its concurrent or dissenting voice to those of our previous witnesses. True, few of the inscriptions have as yet been fully deciphered ; yet they have been so far mastered, as to leave to skepticism itself no ground for doubting the validity of the principles, and the approximate correctness of the results.

Speaking in a general way, the exhumed palaces and temples of Nineveh, with their endless bas-reliefs and inscriptions, their colossal bulls and lions, abundantly confirm the traditions of antiquity respecting the majesty and splendor of the Assyrian empire. They display unlimited resources of wealth and power, and a spirit and truthfulness of art not formerly supposed to have belonged to the barbaric civilizations of the east. Again, sculpture and inscription alike attest the warlike character of Assyria. The head of a man, the wings of an eagle, the body of a lion, united in the majestic image that reposed at their palace gates, seem but a just symbol of the strength, swiftness, and intelligence that bore Assyria to empire. Battles and sieges, fording rivers, scaling towns, battering walls, pursuing the routed, insulting the captive, counting or trampling on the slain—such are the subjects to which the long miles and miles of spirited sculpture on the Assyrian palace walls are devoted, and which the arrow-head characters only transform into the less picturesque, but more exhaustive form of language. Peoples of the most various culture and physiognomy attest the wide compass of Assyrian warlike enterprise. The Bactrian camel, the elephant, the rhinoceros, appearing on the monuments, take the

remotest eastern expeditions out of the category of fable; while multitudes of scarabæi, and other products of Egyptian art, show the early connection of Assyria and Egypt.

Again, the language of the inscriptions fully establishes what many had doubted, the Semitic character of the Assyrians. It shows them using a common language, worshipping common deities, and betraying in all respects a common origin with their Babylonian neighbors, and thus sharply distinguished from the Arian family. The overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus was therefore the termination, probably, of nearly twenty centuries of Semitic ascendancy, and the transfer of the "rod of empire" to that larger Arian family, which, if not more intense and energetic, has shown a more elastic and diffusive character, and adjusted itself with a more broad and comprehensive sympathy to all the capacities and movements of the race.

But to come to more specific points. The inscriptions are almost endlessly various, covering obelisks, tablets, statues, the colossal bulls, lining the friezes, and accompanying the bas-reliefs in the immense halls of the palaces. They vary in length, from the brief votive tablet to the detailed annals of a reign, annals marked by the most naked simplicity of style. Thus the celebrated black marble obelisk in the British Museum, taken from Nimroud, records the events of a reign of thirty-one years. The record is prefaced with the name of Assar, the great god of Assyria, Anu the king (Anamelech of the Old Testament), and El, and Beltis the mother of the great god. Then follows the name of the king, now read as Shalmanubar, that of his father and grandfather. After an introduction as yet unintelligible, he proceeds to chronicle, year by year, the events of his reign—a reign apparently of incessant and successful military enterprise. Babylon and Borsippa, Hamath and Syria, Tyre and Sidon, Armenia and the nations of the east, are in turn attacked and made tributary.

While, however, multitudes of proper names and portions of inscriptions were deciphered, it was some time before the name of any known Assyrian monarch was clearly made out.



The name of Sargon, known from Isaiah, was first guessed at rather than read, in the inscription of Korsabad, but remained for some time unsubstantiated. In 1850, Dr. Hincks believed that he had discovered in the founder of Koyunjik the name of Sennacherib (Sanherib), and in the southwest palace of Nimroud that of his son and successor, Esarhaddon. In 1851, the name of Hezekiah, and an account of Sennacherib's expedition against him, were simultaneously made out by Hincks and Rawlinson, in the monuments of Koyunjik. These readings tended to clear up the doubts regarding the name in the inscriptions of Korsabad: for this name was identical with that of the father of the founder of Koyunjik. This would point to Salmanassar, as only six years intervened between the capture of Samaria by Salmanassar and Sennacherib's invasion of Judea. But a town of Sargon, on the site of Korsabad, is spoken of by the Arabic geographer, Jakuti, in the sixth century of our era. The inference thence drawn of the identity of Salmanassar with Sargon was confirmed by further disclosures in the palace of Korsabad. Salmanassar, it will be remembered, destroyed Samaria, subdued Phœnicia, carried his arms to Cittium; in Cyprus, and (identifying him with the Sargon of Isaiah) sent his conquering forces against Ashdod and Egypt. Most of these events are mentioned in the inscriptions. Samarina beth Khumri, a city which he captured, is made out from concurrent evidence to be Samaria, the house or city of Omri. Hamath and Ashdod appear among his conquests; he recounts a successful expedition against Egypt; and a statue of an Assyrian monarch found at Cittium in Cyprus, was recognized by Rawlinson on a visit to Berlin, as that of the founder of Korsabad.\*

The annals of Korsabad moreover contain the name of a prince in Babylonia who arrogates to himself the title of King of Babylon, whose name is deciphered as Merodach Bal-

---

\* It is proper to state, that Rawlinson recently adopts the hypothesis that Salmanassar and Sargon were different persons, and that Sargon was a usurper, who completed in his first year the conquest of Samaria, which Salmanassar had begun. This hypothesis compels him to alter conjecturally the Hebrew dates.

adan. This prince Sargon dethrones and drives into banishment. In Kings and Isaiah we find a Merodach Baladan, son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sending presents to Hezekiah, during the reign of Sennacherib, and congratulating the Jewish prince on his recovery from illness. The fact standing isolated and unexplained in Scripture, finds its solution in the Assyrian annals of Sargon and Sennacherib. Baladan there named as the father, is probably the Baladan deposed by Sargon, and his son sends to Hezekiah from a sympathy begotten by their common hostility to Sennacherib.

We turn to Koyunjik. The historical coincidences above mentioned first substantiated the conjecture which assigned this palace, the most magnificent creation of Assyrian royalty, to Sennacherib. The name itself has also been analyzed in a manner tolerably satisfactory. The reign of Sennacherib is believed to have extended over 22 years, of which only eight are embraced in the annals yet discovered. Although dark and disastrous in its close, his reign in its earlier portion was unusually brilliant, as attested alike by the record of his deeds, and the vast extent and sculptured decorations of his palace. At the outset of his reign he marches into Babylon against Merodach Baladan, either the same prince whom his father had encountered, or his sire, triumphs over him, and sets one Belib on the throne. In the fourth year Merodach Baladan reappears, and Belib seems to have entered into conspiracy with him against his Assyrian lord. Sennacherib again marches into Babylonia, defeats Baladan, deposes his viceroy Belib, and places on the throne his son Asordanes. Now the coincidences here with Berosus and the Scripture are curious and important. First, we see at a glance why Merodach Baladan should have sent messengers with presents and congratulations to Hezekiah; it was doubtless to secure his aid against the common enemy, the king of Assyria. Secondly, we have in the Armenian Eusebius the following extract from Berosus: "After the brother of Sennacherib, Acises ruled in Babylon, and was slain by Merodach Baladan after a reign of three days. Merodach Baladan seized the sceptre until he in turn was deposed by Elibus, who succeeded to the throne. During

the third year of Elibus, Sennacherib marched with his forces against the Babylonians, triumphed over them in battle, sent Elibus in chains to Assyria, and placed on the throne his son Asordanes." With this accords substantially the canon of Ptolemy. The monuments partly confirm and partly correct Berosus, showing that Belib or Elibus was placed on the throne as the vassal of Sennacherib. We cannot, of course, yet settle all the minute chronological questions, but the general coincidences are striking. Niebuhr naturally assumed that Asordanes, whom Sennacherib placed on the throne of Babylon, was identical with Esarhaddon, his successor on the throne of Nineveh. The monuments do not seem to confirm this, as the orthography of the two names is uniformly different. We must assume therefore, that on the death of Asordanes, the sovereignty of Babylon reverts to Esarhaddon, who styles himself, like his grandfather Sargon, king of Assyria and Shinar (Babylon). Sennacherib governed Babylon through viceroys.

Of Esarhaddon few inscriptions have been published—enough, however, to show that he maintained both at home and in the field, the glory of the empire. The southwest palace at Nimroud bears his name as its founder, as do those of Korsabad and Koyunjik the names of his grandfather and father. He also built a large edifice which has been laid open at Nineveh, and according to the inscriptions, a palace at Babylon, where he may sometimes have held his court. Hence Manasseh, when carried away by his orders, was taken to Babylon. After the death of Esarhaddon, the empire seems to have rapidly declined. Whether there were two more reigns or three does not appear from the monuments. Berosus seems to make three, Sammughes, Sardanapalus his brother, and Saracus. Ctesias makes Sardanapalus the last. The monuments on this point sustain Berosus, as the builder of the southeast palace at Nimroud declares himself the son of Esarhaddon, and grandson of Assardonpal (Sardanapalus); his own name is read as Asshur-Emit-ili, probably identical with Saracus. The palace of Saracus shows a sinking empire. It is on a scale of much less magnificence than marked

the structures of his predecessors. The vast halls, the large portals, the sculptured alabaster slabs, the decorated walls, are wanting. A palace built by Sardanapalus, his father, however, shows a great progress in Assyrian art. Sardanapalus seems to have had a passion for the chase, and the pictures of wild animals with which he adorned his palace have a freedom, delicacy and truth unknown to previous Assyrian sculpture. Thus in Assyria, as in Greece and Rome, the arts of peace flourished in the decline of the arts of war. Of the final catastrophe which overwhelmed Nineveh, there are of course no monumental records.

Having followed the empire through its later stages, let us turn back and see what light is shed upon its earlier epoch. The oldest palace at Nimroud is that on the northwest corner of the terrace. It is obviously earlier by several generations than that of Korsabad; yet it is, next to the palace of Koyunjik, the most magnificent of the Assyrian edifices. It was a store-house of building materials for the latter princes of the empire, and has furnished a large portion of the sculptures of the British museum. The annals of its founder are very full and complete, and show him to have been a great conqueror, who carried his arms far and wide through western Asia, from Babylonia to the Mediterranean. Remarkably enough his name is Assardonpal, identical with the Sardanapalus of the later empire; and hence, perhaps, the contradictory traditions current in Asia, one of which made Sardanapalus an effeminate reveller, the other, a conquering hero, an energetic and widely ruling sovereign, who founded Auchiale and Tarsus in a day, and whose tomb was shown at Nimroud in the time of Alexander the Great. Indeed, the conical hill at Nimroud was anciently called the tomb of Sardanapalus. Layard found in it a long vaulted room, intended apparently for a sepulchre, and the bricks bearing the name of the son of Sardanapalus. The foundation he believed to have been laid by Sardanapalus himself.

The son of this Assardonpal, called by Rawlinson Shalmanubar or Shalmanassar, built the so-called central palace at Nimroud, and his deeds, comprising the annals of 31 years,



are recorded on the celebrated black obelisk in the British Museum. They constitute one long series of martial enterprises. Armenia, Media, Babylonia, Phœnicia, are repeatedly invaded, sometimes by an army of an hundred thousand men. He conducts repeated expeditions to countries bordering on Palestine, and among his enemies are recognized Benhadad and Hazael, and among his tributaries, Jahua, son of Khumri, who, we cannot doubt, is Jehu, king of Samaria, and thus by common oriental usage called the son of its founder, Omri. This enables us to fix the date of his reign, which falls early in the ninth century, and that of his father, Sardanapalus, which must be late in the tenth.

The successor of Shalmanubar is read upon the monuments as Shamasivah; a younger son, who puts down a rebellion raised against his father by the eldest son, and consequently takes his place on the throne. His reign is of uncertain length, but the four years of his annals include important military campaigns, in one of which he captures two hundred towns, and defeats the combined forces of the Chaldeans, Elamites, and Syrians, mustered by the king of Babylon. He slays 5,000 men, and takes 2,000 prisoners, with 1,000 chariots.

The son and successor of Shamasivah is read as Ivalush, the third of that name. He is conjectured by Rawlinson to be the Pul of the Hebrew Scriptures. Pul appears in Berosus as a Babylonian prince, and it is probable that his rule embraced both Nineveh and Babylon. Ivalush seems "to have been in an especial way connected with Babylonia. He appears to style himself 'the king to whose son Asshur, the chief of the gods, has granted the kingdom of Babylon,' and relates that on his return from a campaign in Syria, in which he had taken Damascus, he proceeded to Babylonia, where he received the homage of the Chaldeans, and sacrificed in Babylon, Borsippa, and Cutha, to the respective gods of those cities, Bel, Nebo, and Nergal."

Our limits restrict us from pursuing the subject further. The chronology of the entire period is yet too unsettled to allow of satisfactory conclusions. In this remote region innumerable deceptive or doubtful flashes must gleam upon

the inquirer's path, mocking, and perplexing, and often misleading him, before the separate rays gradually blend and brighten into the steady light of sure discovery. But that they ultimately will so brighten, we feel assured. From innumerable and unexpected quarters insulated facts will come to light, until at length this vast chasm in the ages will be bridged over by a series of well-ascertained and solid facts, and the growth of the Assyrian empire will become matter of history. Ascending through the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, the monuments present a series of names as yet but imperfectly deciphered, and of which too little is known to justify our dwelling upon them. They only appear in general as conquering and able princes, extending their dominion abroad, and establishing it at home, utterly exploding the worthless statements of Ctesias as to the imbecile character of the Assyrian sovereigns. Thus far, too, the evidence sustains Herodotus as to the antiquity of the Assyrian sway. It is interesting to see at how many vital points they corroborate the statements of the Jewish Scriptures, strengthening our conviction that, even apart from inspiration, we have in them incomparably the most trustworthy documents in the whole compass of ancient history. Their impartiality vindicates itself, and their truthfulness has thus far received attestation from every decisive evidence that has been gathered from the banks of the Nile, the Euphrates, and the Tigris.

The inscriptions indicate with striking clearness the character of the Assyrian empire. That there was no consolidation, no organizing policy, such as gave compactness and durability to the vast dominion of Rome, appears in all the records. Assyria was an empire made up of loosely aggregated kingdoms, held together by nothing but the present conscious pressure of fear and force. The kings were mere conquerors. They swoop down upon the devoted territory with the strength and swiftness of the eagle, receive homage, and levy tribute, but institute no system which shall insure the permanency of the acquisition. Hence they are perpetually fighting "their battles o'er again," reconquering the conquered, and enforcing,

by the presence of a fresh army, the tribute which was withheld as soon as the invading force was withdrawn. Hence, too, the ever-varying limits of the empire, its dependence, far more than in modern states, on the personal ability of the sovereign, and, finally, the almost incredible ease and rapidity with which it fell into dissolution, compared with the long-continued shocks which broke up the thoroughly compacted structure of Roman power.

One word as to the testimony of the monuments regarding the mythical hypothesis of Assyrian history. They evince at once the sagacity and shortsightedness of the criticism which originated it, and which, analyzing a few traditionary names of Assyrian princes, sought to explode the whole from the terra firma of history into the airy regions of fable. They establish its premises and nullify its conclusions. Amidst the varying orthography of the royal names of Assyria, certain names of deities, with certain standing epithets, are of perpetual recurrence. First, and most frequent, is the word *Assar*, or *Asshur*, the name at once of the country and of the great Assyrian war-god; in *San*, *Nebo*, *Bel*, we have the names of other divinities; in *don*, or *adon*, an equivalent to the Hebrew *Adonai* (lord); and in *pal*, or *pul*, a standing epithet for *great* or *illustrious*. These, with kindred elements, constantly enter into the names of the Assyrian monarchs. Thus *Assar-don-pal* is *Sardanapalus*, *Assar-don-assar* or *Assar-don*, is our *Esarhaddon*. *Tiglath-pal-assar* draws its first element probably from the word *Tigris*. *San-herib* (*Sennacherib*) draws its first element probably from the god *San*. So *Nebo-pal-assar*, *Nebuch-adon-assar*. Of course of names thus compounded, some syllables might be often dropped; some doubtless were written that were not pronounced; official designations, like the *Augustus Cæsar* of the Roman emperors, might often co-exist with strictly personal appellations, and thus in many ways the orthography of the princely names of Assyria and Babylon might be rendered very fluctuating. But he would be a bold man who, in the face of all the monumental records, should for any *nominal* reason, consign all these monarchs to the limbo of fable. Ghosts do not rear such palaces, nor chisel their deeds in marble slabs and granite pillars.

## ARTICLE VI.—INDIA.\*

## PART FIRST—ANCIENT INDIA.

ONE of the most curious evidences of the many-sided intellectualism of the age is the readiness with which it pushes forth its vaunted energies in directions precisely opposite. With equal facility it personates the prophet and the historian, ever and anon suddenly halting in its onward progress to make its reverent salaam to hoary antiquity. Nothing more clearly indicates the complete emancipation of modern genius from all specializing tendencies than this, that an age, unparalleled in the ardor with which it engages in the work of invention, is also an age unparalleled in the enthusiasm with which it devotes itself to the enterprise of unearthing the sepulchred past. While enterprising speculators are laying out phantom cities on our western prairies, or steaming down the Mississippi on the look-out for favorable openings, or *prospecting* among the California placers, explorers not less enterprising are threading the Roman catacombs, and laboriously poling up the Nile, and hunting for winged bulls beyond the Euphrates. While bashful country schoolmistresses, in these summer months, are patiently drilling the unnumbered rosy-cheeked scions of our happy land in their pictorial alphabets, erudite linguists are themselves conning over the alphabets of languages which had ceased to be spoken when Prince Eumenes supplanted the ancient rolls with vellum leaves. At

---

\* 1. India, Ancient and Modern. By David O. Allen, D. D., Missionary of the American Board for twenty-five years in India; Member of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and Corresponding Member of the American Oriental Society. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Company. 1856.

2. The Three Presidencies of India. By John Capper, F. R. A. S. London: Ingram, Cooke & Co. 1853.

3. Modern Investigations on Ancient India. A Lecture delivered in Berlin, March 4, 1854. By Professor A. Weber. Translated from the German by Fanny Metcalfe. London: Williams & Northgate. 1857.

4. India, Pictorial, Descriptive and Historical, from the earliest times to the present. London: Henry G. Bohn. 1854.



the very moment that the rushing current of migration is drifting westward huge rafts of old world emigrants, a gentle undertow is bearing back, in a counter-direction, a little band of hardy scholars to those far off Orient regions where rush the Nile and the Indus, inquisitive to discover, if possible, the birthplace of civilization, and to trace the path of her early conquest. To accomplish this, Asia, from the Euxine to the Brahmaputra, is undergoing the sharpest scrutiny of the ethnographer and the philologist. Pre-eminently rich in the materials for such researches is the peninsula of India. Not that we claim for India the honor of being the "cradle of civilization." We only claim for her the dignity of being one of the earliest homes in which civilization settled, when she first sallied forth from the unknown land of her birth. Viewed in this aspect, Indian history is invested with all the charms which belong to a venerable and hoary antiquity. Her speech, her creeds, her philosophy, and her poetry, carry us back to an era, compared with which the Runic wands of the old Norsemen, and even the Sibylline leaves of Cumæ, are almost as much novelties as last night's telegrams from the army of Italian liberation. A thousand years before Claudius Ptolemus reasoned of cycles and epicycles, the Indian Parasara had noticed the position of the solstitial colures. Long before John Napier had covered the walls of his cloister with logarithmic tables, or Tartalia learned to solve equations of the third degree, the Indian mathematicians, Waramihira and Aryabhatta, had ingeniously multiplied the power of numerals by assigning to them a positive value.\* Long before Pindar embalmed in Doric measures the triumphs of the Olympic victor, or Homer sung the fall of nodding Ilium, the Indian bards had immortalized, in gorgeous epics, the exploits of sun-born demi-gods. Long before An-

---

\* "In the algebraic works of the Indians we find the general solution of indeterminate equations of the first degree, and a far more elaborate mode of treating those of the second, than has been transmitted to us in the writings of the Alexandrian philosophers. There is, therefore, no doubt that if the works of the Indians had been known to Europeans earlier, they might have acted very beneficially in favoring the development of modern analysis."—*Charles' History of Algebra, in the Memorials of the French Academy of Sciences.*

selm essayed to give a logical demonstration of the existence of Deity, or Justin Martyr confuted Marcion ; long before the son of Sophroniscus discoursed of immortality, or Pythagoras invented his theory of theologic numbers, the Indian sages were wont to cheat themselves

“ With noisy emptiness of learned phrase,  
With subtle fluids, impacts, essences,  
Self-working tools, uncaused effects.”

The researches of modern scholars tend to confirm the hypothesis that the speculative philosophies of ancient Egypt and Greece, as well as the transcendental Pantheism of more modern times, are a part of the intellectual heritage transmitted by that remarkably cultivated race which, forty-five hundred years ago, poured through the gates of the Indian Caucasus from the table-lands of upper Iran. Unquestionably, many of the modern languages of Europe, the ancient Greek and Latin inclusive, are of the same radical stock with the Sanskrit, the dialect of the earliest known invaders of India, and for this reason they are styled the Indo-European languages. This Sanskrit, the *perfect language* which Sir William Jones, the eminent Orientalist, describes as “ a language of wonderful structure, more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either,” was the common dialect of northern India or Hindostan,\* and was already rich in a literature of its own, before Remus is fabled to have leaped in derision over the wall of his brother, or the dynasty of the Athenian kings was extinguished by the self-sacrifice of Codrus.

Thus the ancient civilization of India, transplanted while but a sapling from some more temperate region in the northwest, has, like one of her own majestic banyan trees, served as a prolific mother trunk, from which many fresh civilizations have started, and struck their roots into newer soils.

---

\* Historical India may be considered as divided into two parts, the hilly chain of the Virdyhee constituting the dividing line. The northern part, settled mostly by the Hindus, an intrusive race, is called, by way of distinction, *Hindustan*. The southern part, comprising the Dekhan and the Karnatic, contains the most numerous traces of the aboriginal inhabitants.

When we become interested in the history or character of some illustrious personage, nothing is more natural to us than to try to form some idea of his personal appearance. And if by chance, as is most likely in these days of universal photographing, his picture adorns our shop windows, we instinctively halt to scan the lineaments. This impulse undoubtedly springs from the feeling that the physiognomy is a part of the man. We hold that it is not altogether a baseless fancy which represents the physical geography of a province as the physiognomy of the nation which inhabits it. So intimate is the connection of the spirit and life of a people with the outward world in which it moves, that an acquaintance with the latter furnishes data from which we may, with considerable accuracy, determine in advance the former. External circumstances of character of soil and climate, and physical configuration, impress themselves on the genius of a nation, and constitute one of the controlling forces which shape the general direction of its mental and moral movements, and in no instance is this statement, now generally admitted to be founded in truth, confirmed with more emphasis than in the history of India. We propose, therefore, before entering on a sketch of the inner life of India, to trace in very general outlines its physiognomy as engraved in its prominent physical features, and thus furnish our readers with a sort of vignette to the biography itself.

Projecting southward from the heart of Asia, the peninsula\* of India thrusts itself far into the Southern Ocean like a huge pyramid, having for its base the stupendous chain of the Himalaya. The height of this pyramid, from the Himalaya range to Cape Comorin, exceeds in round numbers 1,800 miles, and its breadth, near the line of its base, 1,500. It has an ocean frontier of 3,300 miles. Its superficial area is

---

\* It has been common to speak of India as a peninsula. If by peninsula is meant "a body of land almost surrounded by water, and joined to the main continent by a tract narrower than itself," a single glance at the atlas shows that India fails to answer this definition, since, though laved on three sides by water, its junction with the main continent is the very farthest from being isthmical. Still, custom, which is the real autocrat in matters of definition, sanctions the application of the term peninsula to India.

estimated to be 12,000,000 square miles. It comprises accordingly, a territory three times larger than France and Austria, six times larger than Great Britain and Ireland, as large as all Europe west of Russia and south of the Baltic, larger than all the United States east of the Mississippi, and almost as large as the Roman Empire in the days when Rome was mistress of the world.

A glance at the physical map of this immense territory will show that it occupies a position almost entirely insulated. Nature, as if conscious that India were the Paradise of earth, has jealously guarded her against the violent intrusions of strangers, by environing her almost completely with the mighty barriers of mountain and ocean. As though versed in military strategy, she has circumvallated India by throwing up on the north the towering ramparts of the Himalaya, and entrenching her on the east, south, and west by the Bay of Bengal, the Indian Ocean, and the Arabian Sea. Not content with this outer line of defences, she has thrown up within them a second line of fortifications, in the shape of an almost unbroken range of lofty ghauts, following the coast line of the peninsula from the mouths of the Ganges to the Gulf of Cambay, so that, in respect to her mountain environs at least, India may answer to the Happy Valley of Rasselas.

It is this peculiar configuration of territory, isolating India from the rest of the world, which, as we conceive, accounts in a great measure for that anomaly in her history, namely, her stationary civilization; for all life, intellectual as well as physical, has a mutual exchange of relations for one of its essential conditions; multiplicity and diversity of relations are indispensable to progress and development. Professor Guyot, in his admirable little treatise on comparative physical geography in its relation to human history, has some valuable remarks illustrative of our position. "All life is mutual. Homogeneousness, uniformity, is the elementary or savage state. Diversity, variety of elements, is the characteristic of social advancement. That which excites life, that which is the condition of life, is difference." Now, the exchange of the products of physical and intellectual industry in India



with those of that of other countries, has been rendered extremely difficult by the natural and almost universal blockade of her territory. Geographical isolation has compelled her mental and moral isolation. Confined to her own territories, with only here and there a way of egress through difficult mountain passes, India has known nothing of the world outside her own barriers, and consequently has felt nothing of the exciting and developing energy of foreign intercourse. Her intellectual resources have neither been diversified nor multiplied by fresh combinations with foreign influences. Her physical insulation (and this remark is equally true of China, as is evident from a survey of the physical map of the country) has denied to India one of the indispensable conditions of national progress. And if she has been able to maintain the high standard of civilization, which, forty centuries ago, her Arian invaders from the northwest introduced with themselves, this circumstance is the result of the extraordinary diversity of her own climate and natural scenery. The wonderful variety of her own physical geography has partially compensated her for the want of that healthy outward excitement, and contact with diverse and re-acting influences, which are so essential to intellectual growth and development. As it is, cut off by her natural barriers from the invigorating influences of foreign intercourse, her genius has acted only on itself, giving to her intellectual history the character of a narrow, one-sided, and arrested civilization. During the hundred years that the Anglo-Saxon race have been throwing open the gates of India to the world, supplying the Ganges and Indus with ferries, clearing highways through the mountain passes, and opening the ports of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, India has experienced a wonderful quickening of mental life, and made more progress in civilization than during the three thousand years of her previous history.

We have alluded to the marvellous variety of Indian scenery. It seems as if nature must have exhausted on this fair territory her power of landscape combinations. Sublimity and beauty are everywhere wedded. Majestic rivers intersect exuberant plains. Gigantic mountains cast their sublime shad-

ows over many a league of stately plateaus. Magnificent forests skirt, with robes of perpetual emerald, interminable savannas of billowing grasses. Rugged ghauts flank, with their granite palisades, lotus-kissed lakes. Nor is the variety of landscape unattended by variety of climate and natural productions. Stretching north and south for nearly two thousand miles, the climate of India undergoes every variation of temperature, from the polar cold of the snowy chain to the equatorial heat of the ever-verdant Aligherry range. The tropic of Cancer divides the peninsula into almost equal parts. Were it not for the immense extent of her mountain ranges, the climate of India would be insupportable, for its northern latitude is that of South Carolina, and nine tenths of it lie south of New-Orleans. This vast region is remarkable for the exuberance of its soil, unsurpassed, even, by our own western prairies, and for the great variety, as well as value, of its natural products. Cotton, indigo, sugar-cane, rice, and most of the cereals, are indigenous. The stately forests furnish abundance of timber for architectural and ornamental purposes. The stanchest ships in the British navy are now built of Indian teak. The vegetation of India develops itself on the grandest scale; even its grasses are arborescent, shooting up, as in the case of the bamboo, to the height of sixty feet. It is unparalleled in the exquisite beauty of its flora. The oleander, the Persian rose, the passion-flower, and the lotus, grow wild in the forests. The perfume in the jungles is sometimes almost overpowering in its very sweetness. India is also very rich in minerals. Iron ore, copper, marble, saltpetre, rock-salt, and coal, are abundant. The ruby, emerald, sapphire, turquoise, opal, and amethyst, often reward the explorer. Everybody has heard of the Indian Koh-i-noor and the diamond mines of Golconda. Every shade of the richer colors is represented in the plumage of the birds of India. As for the mammals, what American boy is there whose eyes have not dilated with wonder as he read of the gigantic white elephant and the ferocious royal tiger of Bengal?

The natural scenery of India has ever been the favorite

theme of poets, from the silver-voiced Kalidasea,\* who warbled of the Feast of Roses, to the gay bard of Erin, who recounted with Anacreontic spirit and measure the triumphs of radiant Nourmahal, Light of the Harem.

Travellers, whose restless feet have pressed the soil of every country on the face of the globe, tell us that in the blooming savannas of this Land of the Sun, in the limpid waters which irrigate her fertile soil, in the golden fruits which peep forth temptingly amid the dense foliage of her graceful trees, and in the deliciousness of her fragrant atmosphere, they see the nearest approach to their ideal of that beauteous paradise which Deity gave to our first parents. Among all these ravishing landscapes, none are more celebrated than the province of Kashmere—*Garden of the Angels*.

“Who has not heard of the vale of Cashmere,  
With its roses the brightest that earth ever gave,  
Its temples, and grottoes, and fountains as clear  
As the love-lighted eyes that hang over their wave?”

We have dwelt thus long on the physical geography of India, because we conceive that it furnishes the key to the peculiar character of its civilization. That civilization is eminently *naturalesque*. Indian scenery reproduces itself in the Indian genius. It prescribes the orbit in which it has revolved for untold ages. The civilization of India is the civilization of a people intellectual by hereditary descent, but enamored of, and completely swayed by, an outward world of peerless beauty. Without conscious aim, without invention, without masculine robustness, without mastery of itself, the intellect of India has yielded itself to the seductions of a voluptuous nature. And never did love-sick swain address himself with more fervid sentimentality to flower and brook,

---

\* This famous poet, whose delineations and praises of nature rival in beauty those of any poet in history, flourished in the brilliant Court of Vikramaditya, and was, consequently, the contemporary of Virgil and Homer. His *chef d'œuvre*, of which many translations, English and German, have been attempted, is the “Sakontala,” in which the poet lavishes all the wealth of his exquisite fancy in portraying the scenery of his native land:

“Willst du die Blüthe des frühen, die Früchte des späteren Jahres,  
Willst du was reizt und entzückt, willst du, was sättigt und nährt.  
Willst du den Himmel, die Erde mit einem Namen begreifen;  
Nenn' ich Sakontala, Dich, und so ist alles gesagt.”—GÖTTE.

and cloud and star, than has the Indian genius poured the wealth of her affections at the shrine of her goddess Nature. And Nature, in her turn, seems to have reciprocated the affection most heartily. She has passionately caressed her adorer, and taught him the songs of pearly streamlet and amorous zephyr, and festooned him with flowers, and, with many a mesmeric charm, soothed him into perpetual day-dreams of exquisite delight.

And how could it have been otherwise? The people of India, though richly endowed with intellectual gifts, as descendants of the great historical race of antiquity, have felt the soporific influence of the tropical climate. Still, they could not give up their intellectual inheritance. Overpowered by climatic enervation, and yet recoiling from mental inanity, they have managed to effect a compromise between a career of intellectual advancement and a lapse into imbecility, by abandoning themselves to passive contemplation. Too indolent to give direction to their own thoughts, they have yielded them to the capricious guidance of influences from without. And what influence more potent over spirits so exquisitely sensitive to impressions of beauty than the magic of Indian scenery? What wonder is it that the key-note of Indian theology is the recognition and adoration of the divine in nature? What wonder that mental movement here takes the direction of pensive revery? Embowered with gorgeous flowers, why wonder at the floral character of Indian literature? Driven by the fervid climate into the cool and silent retreats of the forest, why wonder at Indian seclusion and quiescence? Soothed into a perpetual coma by the perfumed atmosphere, what wonder that the Indian genius revels only in dreamy fantasies, exhibiting the acuteness, indeed, of the opium-eater, and his imbecility, too? Here in India is the paradise of your genuine Hasheesh-eaters! Public opinion here is not against you. You are not obliged to steal like a culprit into the druggist's and timorously buy the royal dainty by the tiny drachm. The sky rains it upon you; the air surfs it against you; the flowers breathe it up to you. What wonder is it that the sleep-giving lotus is the chosen emblem of India? Alfred Tennyson has pictured it, but not in his "Locksley Hall."



"But, propped on beds of amaranth and moly,  
How sweet (while warm airs lull us, blowing lowly),  
With half-dropped eyelids still,  
Beneath a heaven dark and holy,  
To watch the long bright river drawing slowly  
His waters from the purple hill;  
To hear the dewy echoes calling,  
From cave to cave, through the thick-twined vine;  
To hear the emerald-colored water falling  
Through many a woven acanthus-wreath divine!"

And thus, in the ardent climate of India, in its opiate atmosphere, in its exquisite scenery, and in its mountainous boundaries, we discover the secret of Indian civilization, its adolescent passionateness, its luxurious dreaminess, its gorgeous beauty, and its paralyzed development.

But we are trenching on a territory marked off for future exploration. Reserving for another paper some account of the languages, religions, philosophy, literature, and institutions of ancient India, we now propose to give a very rapid sketch of the principal events in Indian history down to the incorporation of the East India Company.

The early history of India is involved in impenetrable obscurity. Its ancient myths surpass, in wild extravagance, even those of the classic nations of Europe. Nothing is more ludicrous than Hindu chronology, according to which the Brahmanic aristocracy is 320,000 years old. The principal sources of information on this point preceding documentary history, are the Indian Vedas, the Institutes of Manu, the epics of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, the Pali inscriptions, the astronomical charts of Parasara, the synchronisms with authenticated Greek dates, and the ancient languages of the peninsula.

Respecting the date of the *Vedic* Lyrics, the Hindu sacred scriptures, great uncertainty exists. They bear no dates themselves, and their age can be determined only approximately by assuming the probable rate at which they developed the Hindu theology. Unquestionably they are extremely ancient, being probably the oldest writings extant in the world, save the early Hebrew Scriptures. The prevalent opinion is that they were *compiled* by Vyasa, son of the astronomer Parasara,

fourteen hundred years before the Christian era, or about the time of the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan under Joshua. The *Laws of Manu* are supposed to have been codified several hundred years later. These give us the political and social, as the Vedas do the poetical and religious aspects of Brahmanism. The *Ramayana* is the first Indian epic, and answers in character to the Grecian legends of the exploits of Hercules. It celebrates the splendid victories of Rama, king of Ayadhya (Oude), aided by a supernatural race of monkeys, over Ravanne, despot of Ceylon. It is useless to attempt assigning a date to the *Ramayana*, while such an authority as Pritchard states that this "oldest epic poem of the Hindus is allowed on all hands to be more ancient by many centuries than the *Iliad*," and on the same page his learned editor Norris, subjoins in a foot-note: "The age of the *Ramayana* is more generally admitted, even by the most decided partisans of the antiquity of the Sanskrit Literature, to be not older than the fourth century B. C."\*

The *Mahabharata* is the Indian *Iliad*, commemorating the *Great War*, waged between the Yadava and the Paradava dynasties, two branches of the Luna line of Hindu kings. This war, which was as famous in Indian history as the siege of Troy was in Greek, and which enlisted a host of princes on either side, was fought in the Gangetic countries, in all probability as early as the fourteenth century B. C., thus antedating by two hundred years the ordinary date of the Trojan war. This date is obtained by comparing with one another the celestial charts of Parasara, who was reported to be contemporary with the *Great War*, the compilation of the Vedas by Vyasa his son, and the preserved lines of the sovereigns, and the Magadha dynasty, averaging twenty years to each reign, and computing back from the ascertained era of Kandragupta, the Sandracottus of Arrian, the Greek historian. From these three independent sources of inquiry it seems tolerably certain that the date of the *Mahabharata* is somewhere between 1350 and 1400 B. C. Great confidence is reposed by Davis,

---

\* Pritchard's *Natural History of Man*: Edited by Edwin Norris; vol. i., p. 249.

Hillford, and especially Colebrooke, a very learned and cautious investigator of Indian antiquities, in the ancient *astromonomical charts* of the Brahmans, and particularly that of Parasara, which fixes the positions of the colures 1391 years before Christ. But it is to be questioned whether these dates furnish reliable evidence, since recent investigations seem to indicate that they were "derived from a division of the heavens, which does not belong originally to the Hindus themselves, but was borrowed by them from the Semitic races, perhaps from the Babylonian."\*

The *Pali characters* are Budhistic inscriptions on the walls of excavated temples. The ingenious and indefatigable Prinsep has recently succeeded in deciphering many of them. They are valuable for the light they shed on some disputed points in the history of Budhism, but principally because they approximately designate the era of the reign of the brilliant Asoka, who, of all the Hindu sovereigns first won the title of lord paramount of India. This was in the third century before Christ. Of course all these dates which we have given are to be received with great caution; for these poems, codes, charts, and inscriptions, are themselves dateless. Their respective epochs have been assigned to them on the score of internal evidence, as if each of them had been begun and finished by the same person, or in the same century. But who knows how long the Vedas, or the Institutes of Manu, were in process of construction? †

Of greater value as sources of historical information are established *synchronisms of reputed Indian with authenticated Greek dates*. Such, for instance, is the recent identification, originally a happy conjecture of Sir William Jones, of Kandragupta, the *parvenu* king (he had been a Sudra), with the

---

\* Prof. A. Weber's lecture on "Modern Investigations on India," delivered in Berlin, March 4, 1854.

† Although all inquirers admit that creeds, languages, and social conditions, present the phenomena of *growth*, the opinions as to the *rate* of such growth are varied, and none are of much value. This is because the particular induction required for the formation of anything better than a mere impression has yet to be undertaken, till when, one man's guess is as good as another's. The age of a tree may be reckoned from its concentric rings, but the age of a language, a doctrine, or a polity, has neither bark like wood, nor teeth like a horse, nor a register like a child."—*Latham's Descriptive Ethnology*, vol. ii., p. 322.

Sandracottus of Arrian, the Sandracaptus of Athenæus, and the Xandramus of Diodorus, whom they represent to have concluded a treaty with the first Seleucus about 310 B. C.

But by far the most valuable source of knowledge concerning the early history of India is furnished by a *comparison of its languages, ancient and modern, with one another, and with those of other countries*. In fact, language is the only reliable evidence in respect to anti-historical periods. It is only since the beginning of this century that comparative philology has risen to the dignity of a special and decisive science. This science is doing more to solve the severe problems of ethnical varieties and ancient ethnical monuments, than the documents of history or the utterances of tradition. Strange, when all other witnesses of a nation's early career have perished—when its political institutions and religious creeds have been extinguished, when even its physiological aspect has undergone changes under the influence of different climates in the course of its migrations, that its *language*, that most empty and evanescent symbol of its early thoughts and emotions, should outlive them all, and utter its testimony with a guilelessness that stamps as a falsehood many a historic record. The nation may die, but its language is immortal, surviving either in its native land, or transplanted to other realms, to tell the story of the nation's birth, and manhood, and death.

Cautiously, but perseveringly, going back of all recorded history, and even tradition, Comparative Philology is seeking to uplift the veil which hides from our sight the history of aboriginal India. It has undertaken, and not without success, the difficult exploit of settling the primitive ethnology of the Peninsula. Without attempting to enunciate formally in this paper the special hypothesis and conclusions of scholars on this point, we shall content ourselves with stating in the concise terms the general result of the latest researches on this question, as conducted by Pritchard, Latham, Hodgson, and Max Müller.

The people whom we now call the Hindus—understanding by this term the descendants of the ancient Arian race, were not the aborigines of India. Centuries before they made their advent in the fertile valleys of the Panjub or Five Rivers, and



on the high plains of Hindustan, numerous nomadic tribes of the Turanian race were roaming over the peninsula, from the Kashmere Valley to the Island Bridge of Ceylon. They spoke the various dialects of the Tamulic language, which is agglutinate, and thus essentially distinct from the Sanskrit, which is inflectional. What people preceded this Tamulian, or ante-Arian race, we have no means at present of determining. It is reason enough for self-congratulation, that, in spite of the absence of historic records, we can go back in our knowledge of India at least twenty-five centuries before the birth of Christ.\*

These Tamul-speaking aborigines are still largely represented in the present population of India, numbering perhaps thirty millions out of the one hundred and forty. It has been common to speak of them as barbarian hordes, who retreated southward before the advances of a superior race, just as our own aborigines have retreated westward before the march of the Anglo-Saxons. It is true that the great body of them were forced downward across the Vindyha Chain, into the Dekhan, by the pressure of the intrusive race; still, instead of being confined to Southern India, they are found here and there scattered throughout the Peninsula, and even in Eastern Persia. There is also considerable evidence to show that, while they were inferior in culture to the Arian invaders, the popular historians in India have done injustice to these aborigines by describing them as rude savages. Though generally nomadic in their habits, they certainly built cities, and cities are not the work of barbarians. The great similarity between the various Tamulic dialects points back to an original political and literary unity, and the maintenance of their grammatical independence, in spite of the large infusion of Sanskrit words into their vocabularies, argues a considerable degree of intellectual force and culture. But we must not

---

\* The existence of certain hill-tribes, particularly the Sinbhum, the Sontal, the Bhumij, and the Murdala, Kales, between whose dialects and those of the Tamulic class no affinity has yet been traced, has suggested the hypothesis that these are more strictly speaking the aborigines of India, having been driven into their mountain fastnesses by their Tamulian conquerors. This is Dr. Max Müller's opinion.

loiter among these primitive Turanian settlers too long. The irruption of a new and nobler race arrests now our attention. Nevertheless, we are still compelled to grope our way in the dark labyrinths of an unrecorded antiquity.

Leaving our peninsula, and wending our way in a north-west direction through one of the gorges of the Hindu Kush, let us skirt along the northern base of the Gun Range and the southern shore of the Caspian, till we arrive at the geographical centre of Asia-Europe. Here, or in the immediate vicinity, tradition testifies, and the inductions of ethnology and philology with emphasis confirm the testimony, was the primary centre from which the great historic movements of humanity have radiated. Here, under the genial influences of a perfect climate, were developed that vigor of intellect at once versatile, comprehensive, and acute, and that dynamic, exhaustless force of will, which have made the descendants of the race once inhabiting this region, the leading actors in the mighty drama of the ages.\* Described from various stand-points, as, for example, historical, geographical, physiological, and linguistical, they appear under different names, such as the Japetic, the Caucasian,† the Arian, or the Indo-European variety.

Accepting the doctrine of the common descent of mankind from a single pair, not only as the direct teaching of the Mosaic record, and a resistless influence from the Christian scheme of atonement, but also as one of the grand inductions of ethnology, in process of rapid confirmation by the researches of comparative philology, yet without attempting to localize precisely the original spot whence the waves of migration were propagated, we follow Dr. Max Müller's theory

---

\* We follow the common view, adopted by Dr. Pritchard, which represents western Asia as the primary seat of the Arian or Indo-European races, and the march of civilization as advancing, with certain exceptions, from east to west. It ought to be observed, however, that Dr. R. G. Latham, no mean authority in matters of ethnology, entertains an entirely different theory. He conceives the Arian race to be of European origin, and their representatives in Asia-European Colonists.

† The term Caucasian defines in no sense, save an arbitrary, the Arian race, and should be suffered to drop into oblivion. Nothing is clearer than that the inhabitants of Mount Caucasus, with perhaps the exception of the Ossitines, are, and always have been, essentially distinct from the Indo-European family.

as to the probable chronological order of these primary migrations. The first great movement from the common centre of mankind seems to have been in an eastward direction, when the primitive speech was in its incipient culture, giving rise to that singular linguistic phenomenon, the Chinese language. The second general movement was that of the Turanian tribes, carrying with them the primitive speech in a higher state of development; they dispersed themselves mostly north and south, gradually assuming more distinct forms, and finally giving rise to the five great nomadic races, the Uyrian, the Turkish, the Mongolian, the Tunyusian, and the Bhotiyan. The third movement was that of the Semitic variety, carrying with them a more crystalline form of speech, and subsequently developing into the colonies of northern Africa, including Egypt and Babylonia, Syria and Arabia.

The fourth and final great movement from the primary centre was that of the Arian stock. Remaining longest in their original home, and consequently having had time to mature in quietness their intellectual powers, the primitive language developed itself into the most perfect of the forms of human speech, which, propagating itself through forty-five centuries of time, from the Ganges to the Highlands of Scotland and the northern extremities of Scandinavia, has re-produced itself in the languages of the Sanskrit, the Zend, the Greek, the Latin, the Lithuanian, the Teutonic, the Slavonic, and the Keltic, and to this day vocalises for us Americans the commonest and tenderest relations of life.\*

The main stream of Arian migration always flowed in a northwesterly direction, thus coinciding with the geographical march of history. Moved by some inscrutable impulse, two streamlets found their way south and southeast, the one to worship the elements on the table-lands of Bactria, and the other to dream of Brahm the Impersonal in the sacred forests

---

\* It has been the fashion to speak of the Sanskrit as the original basis of the Indo-European languages. Recent investigations indicate that the Keltic was the earliest of the Arian migrations, and the Sanskrit the latest. Instead, therefore, of being the mother of the Arian family of languages, the Sanskrit is the youngest daughter, and consequently may be supposed to represent more accurately the perfection of the original Arian speech before it was alloyed by Turanian elements.

of Aryavarta. These latter were the Hindus, or Sanskrit-speaking people. At what precise time they forsook their primeval abode to develop, in their new tropical home, a loftier civilization than the sons of Tru had known, we cannot possibly determine. Though probably the last great wave of the Arian migration, their initial movements are forever lost in the mighty abyss of a pre-historical oblivion. Historians are compelled to traverse that unannalled realm as the gods of Homer moved through space. Ages glide away between the successive strides. Dr. Pritchard assigns to the Hindus a separate national existence in northwestern India as early as twenty-five centuries before the Christian era. We do not, however, assign to them a particular history long anterior to the composition of the Vedic hymns, which could not have taken place later than the fourteenth century before Christ, and which, there are many reasons for supposing, may have taken place four centuries earlier. Having crossed the Indus, they slowly advanced east and south, till, in the course of many centuries, they seem to have dispersed themselves over the entire peninsula, becoming, however, numerically weaker, and assimilating more and more, in physiological features and in language, to their predecessors of the Turanian stock, as they recede from the Indus. It is true that Morris questions "whether all the languages of India are not of one origin, with the only difference, that the so-called Sanskrit dialects have received a much more copious infusion of Sanskrit words than the southern tongues." He does not hesitate to avow his conviction that "*the Tartar structure is that of every Indian language.*"\* Still, there are very noticeable physical and glottal peculiarities, clearly distinguishing the intrusive Hindu-Arian from the aboriginal Nishadas or Tamul-speaking branches of the Turanian stock.†

In the pristine Vedic period, the government of the Indo-Arians seems to have been patriarchal. Simple in their habits,

---

\* Pritchard's *Natural History of Man*. Fourth edition. Vol. i., pp. 167 and 248. Notes.

† A most graphic delineation of their differences in form and feature, by B. F. Hodgson, the very eminent Indianist, is quoted by Professor Max Müller in his letter to Chevalier Bunsen on the classification of the Turanian languages. See Bunsen's *Philosophy of Universal History*, vol. i., pp. 347, 348.



contemplative in their tendencies, devoted to agriculture, and fond of home, the earliest stage of Hindu history was adorned with the severer virtues. Woman was specially honored. The marriage relation was esteemed sacred, and polygamy was very rare. In that primeval era, every man was his own priest. But as the religious life was gradually unfolded, and rites were multiplied, and the early, simple faith, under the expanding influence of a strongly-marked speculative tendency, developed into an elaborate and intricate system of theology, a specially trained and consecrated priesthood became a necessity. Certain families, of superior culture, and specially skilled in the interpretation of sacrificial hymns of the Vedas, already growing ancient, were invested with sacerdotal functions. From the circumstance of their being compelled to say many *brahmanas*, i. e., *prayers*, they were called Brahmins. Hence arose Brahminism, which does not seem to have been an original element of the Hindu civilization. Meanwhile, with the unfolding of the religious life and creed, there was, as it is easy to see must have been, an unfolding of the intellectual. In the age when Gileadite caught Ephraimite with the guile of his Shibboleth, the cultured dwellers on the banks of the thrice-sacred Saravasti were carrying on to still greater perfection the most flexible and musical of human dialects.

Increasing literary intercourse developed that tendency to organization which has always distinguished the Arian character. Families clustered into hamlets; hamlets grew into cities; cities became the capitals of kingdoms. The patriarchate was now supplanted by the state; adjoining kingdoms soon became rivals. As an immediate consequence, the military passion was awakened. Hence sprang up the Kshatriya, or Warrior Class.\*

---

\* We object to the application of the term *caste* to this period of Hindu history. Caste, like Brahminism, was not a constituent element of the pristine Hindu civilization. As an institution it belongs to a later period. As Brahminism had been the offspring of a religious necessity, so caste was of a political. It was the natural weapon which an intrusive people, conscious of superior culture, instinctively wielded as a means of self-defence against the extending pressure of a race that could bring against them overwhelming odds of numerical strength. The very term in Sanskrit for caste is *varna*, *color*. It primarily expressed the distinction between the Arian a light brunette, and the Turanian, a dark brown. Subsequently, in the hands of an artful hierarchy, who fractured the two original castes into minute sub-divisions, it became an ecclesiastical instrument of tremendous power.

We may be allowed here to point out a curious illustration of the necessity imposed on our missionaries to acquaint themselves with the primary and recondite elements of the creeds of the heathen among whom they labor. It is well known that caste is the most serious obstacle to the progress of the Gospel in India. The Brahmins, who alone are authorized to interpret the Vedas or Holy Words, which the Hindu laity hold in the profoundest reverence, are in

Up to this time the Hindus have been advancing from their original settlement in Northwestern India only very slowly. But the bursting forth of the martial spirit suddenly inaugurated for them a career of conquests. The rapid increase of their population also began to press them out violently. They now seized possession of all the Gangetic countries. The Vindhya chain does not check their impetuosity. They hurl themselves into the Dekkan. They scour the Karnatic plain. And now India is theirs—from mountain to straits, and from bay to sea. This was the true age of Hindoo chivalry. For, the Indo-Arian, with all his effeminacy and shuddering at sight of blood, can on occasion fight as doughtily as ever his sterner Europo-Arian cousins did in those palmy days, when to tilt in tournament was no boy's play. The recovery of the famous southern penitent, Mani Ayasteya, by King Bama, an exploit in many particulars reminding us of the chivalrous rescue by the Patriarch Prince of his mercenary nephew from the hands of King Chedorlaomer, is as brilliant a specimen of knight-errantry as ever adorned the annals of the Plantagenets.

Meanwhile, Vedantism, under the unwearied manipulations of the twice-born sons of Manu, had grown into a gigantic system of ecclesiastical and political oppression. The usurpation of unlimited power by a few, even though they had been invested with the Sacred Thread, rendered a great popular reaction inevitable. Revolutions never lack leaders; they spontaneously generate them. It was so in India. In the sixth century before Christ, Sakya Muni, assuming to himself the title of Gotoma Buddha, inaugurated the Great Rebellion, and became the Luther of India. What the Reformation was to Popery, that Buddhism was to Brahmanism. Rejecting the inspiration of the Vedas, trampling on the prerogatives of the Hierarchy, and ignoring caste distinctions, it enunciated in a definite creed what an oppressed race wanted. For, it must be remembered, that the great mass of the people were still non-Arian. Buddhism spread with wonderful rapidity over the entire Peninsula. It soon became, and for many centuries continued to be, the state religion. But Brahman-

---

the habit of asserting that caste distinctions are recognized and enforced everywhere in the Vedas. The truth seems to be that the Vedas indicate nothing of the kind; and thus a formidable obstacle to Christianity exhales away in the crucible of investigation. The discovery is suggestive. Paul quoting on Mars' Hill from an obscure heathen poet presents a scene worthy the serious meditation of those not uncommon missionaries, who, gifted with more zeal than apparent knowledge, imagine that Carey and his compeers could have served their Master better than by studying the *Vedas*, or translating the *Ramayana*.

ism, though vanquished, never lost its foothold in India. Watching its opportunity, it eventually succeeded in regaining its ancient supremacy, and forced Buddhism, after many a fierce struggle, to retreat into Southeastern Asia and the Indian Archipelago, where it has found an abiding home.

In the year 326, B. C., Alexander the Great crowned an unparalleled career of conquests by receiving the homage of King Porus in his own palace, on the Hyphasis. But he did not remain long enough in the country to found a permanent sovereignty. Alexander's invasion of India, which Humboldt elevates to the dignity of a *scientific expedition*, is interesting mainly for the reason that it suggested to Arrian, a great chronicler of the second century, his *Indica*, in which he describes the institutions, customs, and character of the Hindus in language which, though written more than sixteen hundred years ago, is perfectly applicable to the Hindus of the present day.

But we must accelerate our pace. Our readers will excuse us from attempting further to unravel the web of the Indian annalist, at least that thread of it which chronicles what, by way of distinction, may be styled the Hindu period of Indian history. For declining this ungracious task, we feel assured that our readers will not only sincerely thank us, but will be disposed to commend our judgment, a commendation (we are not too modest to say it) in which we heartily coincide. For, aside from the extreme unreliableness of the annals themselves, Hindu history, like a long ocean voyage, is exciting only in its beginning and in its end, while between the far off-port from which we have dimly seen it emerging, and the near-by haven in which we shall presently see it moored, heaves in tidal repetend a vast ocean of inanity. Accordingly, dropping our anchor at only two or three islands on the main route, we shall make short work of Hindu history, even though between the sacred songs of the Indo-Arian and the fierce battle-cries of his Moslem conquerors stretches the mighty waste of thirty centuries.

Starting from the Macedonian Invasion, let us take a bold leap of ten centuries. Not long after the Arabian prophet had unfurled the banner of the Crescent, his followers, fired with martial zeal in behalf of their faith, suddenly appeared on the northwestern frontier of India. Henceforth, for centuries, Hinduism and Islamism engage in a prolonged death-grapple for the sovereignty of the peninsula. We stop not to recount the marvellous exploits of Arab, Affghan, and Tartar invaders, or the rise and fall of the great dynasties of Ghazni, Ghorî, Kuttub, Khilgu, and Togluk, which fill up the interim between the tenth and fourteenth centuries. It may be styled the



crimson era of Indian history. In the beginning of the fifteenth century an historic character makes his advent in the sanguinary drama. Timour, fresh from the conquest of Persia, swept like a whirlwind over Hindustan. Passing by several potentates of inferior renown, we find, in 1526, the celebrated Baber establishing at Delhi the renowned dynasty of the Moguls. Descended on his father's side from Tamerlane, and on his mother's side from Ghengis Khan, the two great Tartar conquerors of the middle ages, Baber, himself, was not less illustrious as an author, an artist, a warrior, and a civilian. In 1556, his grandson Akber, a name scarcely less celebrated in Indian annals, ascended the throne of Delhi. It is to be questioned whether an abler sovereign ever wielded the sceptre of India. His reign is remarkable chiefly for the grandeur of the scale on which he developed the internal resources of his realm. After reigning fifty-one years he was succeeded by his son Selim, who arrogated to himself the title of Juhangher—*conqueror of the world*. Juhangher's chief claim to celebrity was his marriage to the peerless Busian beauty, Sultana Nourmahal. Under the adroit management of the imperial consort, vast dominions in Southern India were reduced beneath the sway of Islam.

But the Mahometan sceptre did not reach the climax of its power and glory till the middle of the seventeenth century, when Aurungzebe, the last in the order of genius, of a race of mighty sovereigns, ascended the throne of the Grand Mogul. There can be little doubt that the reign of Arungzebe, lasting forty-nine years, is unparalleled in magnificent splendor by the reign of any other monarch in the history of the world. On the accession of Baber, his great-great-grandfather, India, except under the short and brilliant administration of Asoka, had never been subject to a common ruler. There were, perhaps, thirty different kingdoms in the peninsula. Aurungzebe consolidated most of these kingdoms into one empire, and annexed to it the provinces of Kabul on the west, and Assam on the east. Nabobs, rajahs, nizams, and teishwas were proud to do him homage. Rich as his ancestors were, their riches were but poverty compared with the unexampled opulence of this splendid potentate. The emperor's favorite abode (his summer vacations were spent at the watering places of the Kashmere valley) was a magnificent pavilion, covering two acres, the entire extent of which was carpeted with cloth of gold. The awning of this immense pavilion was made of silk and velvet, embroidered with gold, and fringed with pendent gems. The omrahs, or nobles, had similar pavilions, though smaller in extent. "Their tents were of scarlet velvet, so heavily em-



broidered with gold that the poles which supported them were as thick as the masts of ships, and some of them were from thirty-five to forty feet in height."\* On his birthday, Aurungzebe was weighed in golden scales (unfortunately for his retinue he was remarkably slender), against perfumes and artificial fruits of gold; these the emperor scattered with his own hands among his courtiers. Many hundred elephants marched before him in companies, most gorgeously caparisoned, and the leading elephant in each company had his head plated with gold, and his breast set with rubies and emeralds. This great Mogul was not content with less than seven thrones. The richest of them was the famous Peacock throne, called so because a part of it resembled the expanded tail of a peacock, the natural colors of which were imitated by skilfully blending together sapphires, rubies, emeralds, pearls, and diamonds. Tavernier, a French jeweller, who visited Delhi in 1665, and saw this throne, estimated that its cost exceeded \$30,000,000! The Imperial army consisted of 60,000 horsemen, and 100,000 infantry. The number of suttlers and camp followers was nearly half a million. The camp itself was thirty miles in circuit.

But all this power and splendor could not avert death. In 1707, after reigning half a century, Aurengzebe died. With his death began the rapid decline of the Mogul dynasty. His successors were weak-minded profligates, whom Lord Macaulay graphically describes as "sunk in indolence and debauchery, sauntering away life in secluded palaces, listening to buffoons, chewing bang, and fondling concubines." Thirty years after Aurungzebe's death, Nadir Shar, a sanguinary Persian invader, sacked Delhi, massacred a countless host, bore away in triumph the peacock throne of the Moguls, and the Koh-i-noor mountain of light, which glittered in the London Crystal Palace of 1851, together with five hundred millions of gold and treasures. Soon the fiery beacons of the terrible Mahrattas gleamed in triumph from the minarets of the mosques of Delhi. And here, in 1764, four years after the famous battle of Plassy, the Moslem dominion in India may be properly said to end.

In this very rapid sketch of Indian history, we have forborne to make any comments on the awful miseries which the irruptions of these successive conquerors inflicted on the teeming millions of the country. The political history of India, so far back as we can trace it, presents a most gloomy picture, with a deep, dark perspective of wretchedness and degradation, of

---

\* Lord Mahon's History of England, vol. ii., p. 479.

civil wars and lawless violence, of an iron despotism everywhere triumphant. During this long and dismal period, dynasty succeeded dynasty; the aboriginal king gave way to the Hindu chieftain, the Hindu chieftain to the Moslem tyrant, the Moslem tyrant to the Tartar despot; but neither Hindu, Moslem, nor Tartar, brought to the suffering people any mitigation of their woes, or gladdened their hearts with the hope of brighter days. The carnage which attended these conquests is heart-sickening. We give a single example. It was the boast of Nadir Shah, the Persian usurper, that in his march on Delhi he himself had massacred more than a hundred thousand human beings who had never done him wrong; and again, in one of his desolating raids, this second "scourge of God" built an immense pyramid out of the skulls of those who had fallen victims to his relentless scimitar. At sight of a picture like this, what man recoils not in affright?

But suddenly the fierce battle-cry of "England and Saint George!" rings through the deep gorges and rustling jungles of India. Now follows a scene to which the war eclogue of Coleridge seems hardly more than a tender proem. Naught else do we see or hear but—

"The bursting shell, the gateway wrenched asunder,  
The rattling musketry, the clashing blade;  
And ever and anon, in tones of thunder,  
The diapason of the cannonade."

In vain now speeds the Rohilla lance. In vain now flashes the Moslem sabre. In vain now dashes the Mahratta charger. Onward, and yet onward, through tangled ravines and over rugged ghauts, gleam the British bayonets. Victory hastens after victory. Rajahs, affrighted, flee or yield. The proud heirs of the mighty Aurungzebe humbly sue for a pension at the feet of a trading corporation. Territory after territory sweeps as if by magic within the ever-circling domain of British sovereignty. And now the standard of St. George waves over the corpse of the devotee as it floats down the sacred Ganges, opens its folds as the gallant prow of the British sailor sweeps round Cape Comorin, casts its shadows over the classic river once cleaved by the gay galleys of Alexander, and flutters its pennons amid the snow-charged storms of the Himalaya. Nor is the career of its conquests yet ended; for the advancing war-drums of England are resounding to-night before the ramparts of Canton, and the echo of her cannonading, booming over the valley of the Scinde, has scarcely ceased reverberating on the ear.

(To be Continued.)

## ARTICLE VII.—SHORTER BOOK NOTICES.

## I.

BENGEL'S GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.\*—This has been before the world now for something more than a century, and its main features of excellence are perfectly familiar to the scholars of every country in Christendom. It is, therefore, quite superfluous to utter any commendations on the original work, which is now for the first time, by the liberal enterprise of the Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, made available to the mere English reader and the indifferent Latin scholar. For the liberal expenditure that gives us the five noble volumes before us, we have to thank the publishers and importers in behalf of hundreds of our ministers and intelligent laymen. The translation, so far as we have examined, has been executed admirably well, and it has been enriched by notes from the principal editor, of considerable value, and by an interesting sketch of the life of Bengel, by the same hand.

It has been the fortune of this work to win increasingly upon the esteem and admiration of Christian scholars. The expositions of Bengel, beyond comparison, perhaps, condensed, sententious and suggestive, have been appropriated as the common property of New Testament commentators. They have constituted an exhaustless "gold field," whither generations of miners have gone "prospecting," and whence they have continued to fetch "dust" and "ingots," to be minted and stamped for common circulation. How many might make substantially the acknowledgment of indebtedness which Mr. Ellicott, one of the best living commentators on the New Testament, so gracefully makes in the preface to his work on Galatians, "Bengel's Gnomon has, of course, never been out of my hands."

And notwithstanding the present accumulation of excellent helps to the interpretation of the New Testament, Bengel is not yet superseded. In fact, there has never been a time, probably, when the Gnomon stood so high in the general favor as it does at the present. Herein is fulfilling a remarkable utterance, that by a kind of prophetic instinct was given out by him, just as similar utterances have fallen from the lips of other remarkably gifted men. "I shall produce," said Milton, "something that the world will not suffer to die." So Bengel, just before his death, said to his friend Oetinger, "I shall for a while be forgotten, but afterwards come into remembrance." Bengel has indeed come into remembrance, especially during the present generation, and particularly in connection with the work before us. And it is no hazardous prediction to say that he will continue to live in the minds and hearts of the students of God's Word; that in this, his chief work, he has an assured immortality of influence and fame.

As respects mere external helps for the critical interpretation of the New Testament, Bengel's advantages were, of course, inferior to those possessed by the scholars of our day. Yet to those who regard the most ancient

---

\* *Gnomon of the New Testament.* By J. A. Bengel. Translated by Rev. Andrew Robert Fausset, M. A., Trinity College, Dublin. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Sold by Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia. 5 vols. 1859. Pr. \$10.



MSS. as outweighing all others in determining the correct readings of the text, his disadvantages will not appear very formidable. But, however that may be, Bengel's sagacity, and tact, and nice judgment in the use of such sources as he possessed, almost made up for their deficiency.

We will now indicate a few of Bengel's qualities as a commentator, as they have suggested themselves to us in the use of his *Gnomon*.

And first, no commentator ever brought to the exposition of Scripture, a more simple-hearted and earnest love and reverence for the Bible, as the inspired and authoritative word of God. It was no affectation with him to speak, as he often did, of "the *precious* original text of the New Testament." Believing, as he did, in the plenary and *literal* inspiration of Scripture, this language was the expression of a genuine, child-like love for the pure, uncorrupted word of Christ. His regard for the text of Scripture was not a mere scholar's affection; his enthusiastic interest in its study was not the mere glow of intellectual exhilaration. All his studies, both in criticism and exegesis, were a means to an end—that end being the nourishing of piety in his own bosom, and the promoting of a living piety in the church of God. This will not be questioned by any one acquainted with Bengel's writings. He is therefore a perpetual example of the practicability of uniting a careful, cautious, profound study of the Biblical text, aided by all the helps that scholarship can furnish, with an earnest, prayerful, religious life. His example is a standing rebuke of that weak religious sentimentalism that shrinks from a severely critical investigation and handling of Scripture, through fear of personal injury. Bengel, one of the most laborious scholars of his age, one of the severest critics, was at the same time one of the most exemplarily pious of men. And his piety was nursed and strengthened by the close study of the *ipsissima verba*, the very words of the sacred text.

The minute attention that Bengel gave to the signification of even the smallest words of Scripture, his extreme, or, at least, extraordinary, accuracy in exhibiting the nicest shades of thought, expressed in "the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth," was ridiculed by Ernesti, and has often been ridiculed by such as had more sympathy with Ernesti's spirit than with Bengel's. But such men as Tholuck, and even Winer, have appreciated, and noticed in terms of admiration, this conscientious carefulness in dealing with the language of the sacred record.

Again, the *Gnomon* is pervaded throughout by a truth-loving spirit. The author does not appear in the light of a partizan, to force on Scripture favorite meanings. Doubtless he came to his task as commentator with certain doctrinal preferences, and these appear at times in his expositions where many may think they are not warranted in the Scriptures on which he bases them, or which he expounds in harmony with them. We have found occasion to differ decidedly from some of his doctrinal views expressed in his comments on certain passages. But no one, we think, will charge Bengel with consciously and purposely warping the Scriptures to the support of any favorite doctrinal formulas. He was manifestly a man to relinquish a point when convinced, by the application of the canons of criticism, of its unsoundness. And he was manifestly open to conviction of error. This sacrifice—the greatest a scholar can make—he was ever ready to make for the sake of the Master, and of the Master's word. Of this unselfish docility of disposition, this willingness to forego the mere reputation of self-consistency for the sake of a higher good, we might give more than one proof from his writings. Take, for example, the following remark on Rev. i. 10: "I once thought that the vision which Ezekiel relates, from ch. 40, was on the day of the Sabbath, and that that day of the Sabbath might be compared with the Lord's day mentioned in this passage ;



but I now, of my own accord, give up that idea." This hearty self-correction, and this humble acknowledgment of proper correction by others, present the example of Bengel in a very interesting and attractive light. Whilst everywhere exhibiting an outspoken independency of opinion, the independency of studious and prayerful self-reliance, he nowhere shows the bigotry and obstinacy that refuse to see and correct his own errors.

Another feature of Bengel's Commentary, and one of its most striking features, is the evidence, furnished on every page, of his familiar acquaintance with the whole Bible, and of his faith in its spiritual unity. He looked at the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, as one complete whole, of which no one part could be well interpreted without regard to the teachings of all the other parts. In this particular, wherein he appears in such favorable contrast to a later class of critics amongst his countrymen, who delight in rudely dissecting and disintegrating the word of God, we find much of his strength and value as a commentator.

This feature of his *Gnomon* is foreshadowed in the very title-page, where with reference to the name of "*Gnomon*," he tells us that his design is to *indicate or point out* (*Gnomon* signifies *Indicator*) "the simplicity, depth, *concinnity*, and practical adaptation and wholesomeness of the word of God." It is the constant pains Bengel takes to indicate the felicitous "*concinnity*" of the Bible, this skilful joining of all its parts, this mutual relation and connection of its most widely sundered portions; in short, this "*Analogy of Scripture*;" this it is that in our view constitutes one of the most valuable characteristics of his labors on the New Testament. And it is on this point that he says with just emphasis, "My design is also to refute those expositors who put upon *isolated* passages of Scripture their own forced construction, in order to grasp at impressiveness. Instead of this, I mean to insist upon the full and comprehensive force of Scripture in its whole connection." And again on this point he says, "Separate thoughts of each writer must be determined as to their sense according to grammatical and historical laws, but this in constant reference to the totality of the faith, and to revelation as a whole." And yet again, "Though each inspired writer has his own manner and style, one and the same spirit breathes through all, one grand idea pervades all." Admirable words are these, and nobly did Bengel fulfil the promise involved in them. It is evident that in writing almost every separate page of his *Gnomon*, he heard the voice of the Old prophecy sounding in the New: he heard "deep calling unto deep,"—the depths of meaning in the Apocalypse answering to the depths of meaning in Genesis and Leviticus. A commentary written by a man of learning, critical judgment and piety, possessed with such an idea of the Bible, must have a grandeur of movement, and a significance, that will make it worthy of every Christian scholar's close attention. Such a commentary is John Albert Bengel's *Gnomon*.

As an interpreter of the Apocalypse, Bengel acquired an extraordinary reputation, and his investigations and views have influenced almost all the subsequent interpretations of the Book. His labors in this direction were indeed most valuable; not, however, for any detailed chronological results reached by himself, nor for his influence in producing a school of chronologists in Biblical interpretation; but because he brought into clear and distinct light the ancient, apostolic doctrine of the genuine millennial kingdom in contradistinction to the false view engendered by Roman Catholicism, of a millennial kingdom to result from the mere Christianizing of the powers and governments of the world. To use Oetinger's language on this point, Bengel's allotted task was, "to make Chiliasm orthodox." And on this point we wish here to quote an interesting passage from Delitzsch's *Biblical-prophetic Theology*, as given by Außerlen. "If we see more clearly into

the connection of the Old Testament," he says, "it is in consequence of the light which Bengel's views on the Apocalypse have shed on the Old Testament. To whom else do we owe it, that the orthodox church of the present time does not brand the Chiliastic view of the last times as a heterodoxy, as is done in almost all old manuals of dogmatics; but, on the contrary, has allowed it to enter into her innermost life, so that there is scarcely a believing Christian now who does not take this view? To whom else do we owe it, that the Church of our days believes in a glorious future of the people of Israel, and recognizes, consequently, in the Old Testament history of that nation a prognostic of its final history?—in the Old Testament prophecy, a foreseeing not only of the glory of the Gentile Church, but of Israel in the literal sense? To whom else do we owe it that the Church recognizes the truth, that spiritual salvation shall finally embody itself in outward visible reality, and that the Church is able to appreciate aright the reality of the visible character of Old Testament history, and to view the spiritual and the visible in its organic relation and mutual limitation? To none else but to Bengel. It was he who had to pour away the sediment of a theology which, under the semblance of orthodoxy, opposed Chiliasm, even branding it as a heresy, who had to overcome the last supporters of such a theology; and it was he who led the Moravian brethren, who imagined that they themselves realized the glorious future of the Church, the so-called Philadelphian period, to more correct and Scriptural views. He it was who burst through the fetters of an exegetical tradition, which up to his time was thought to be almost infallible, who vindicated the rights of exegesis in relation to dogmatics, as the rights of a mother, and who pointed the Church to the Castalian fount where she can renew her youth. The Church has not yet exhausted the writings of this theologian."

Bengel's general view of the Revelation was, that it was given to furnish a sort of compendious Church history, an outline sketch of the events of the then future centuries of Christianity, and that, too, *in strict chronological succession*. This led to the diligent and erudite ransacking of the annals of history to find the events corresponding minutely with the successive prophecies, and also to the arranging of his celebrated apocalyptic chronology, according to which the first millennium was to commence in the year 1836. Events have proved Bengel's error, the error not only of his reckoning, but also, we think, of his theory. That theory, the principle that the chronology of the Apocalypse can be accurately determined before its fulfilment, is fruitful of misdirection and fanaticism. It leads to a most unprofitable exercise of arbitrary ingenuity in finding the accomplishment of apocalyptic numbers in almost every successive conflict, and commotion, and change in human history.

All such speculations go, as it seems to us, on a wrong principle of interpreting the Book of the Revelation, the principle that the book was intended as a minute prophecy of events to be fulfilled in chronological succession. The true view seems to be that which regards the whole imagery of the book, including the numbers, as symbols of the great epochs and powers of the world, in connection with the church and the kingdom of God. Those symbols, some of them at least, doubtless contain an element of chronology, but held in obscurity till the light of the fulfilling events shines upon it.

But, notwithstanding this error, Bengel should be held in grateful remembrance by the Christian Church for his labor on the Apocalypse, in that he has restored to her the early doctrine of the Parousia or Coming of Christ, the Restoration of Israel, the Millennium, and the outward and glorious Kingdom of God.

We had intended to glean and bring together a number of testimonies from the highest authorities to the worth of Bengel as a commentator of

Scripture. In addition to those already cited, two must suffice. Says Ellicott, in his preface to his commentary to Galatians: "Bengel's Gnomon has, of course, never been out of my hands." The following, which from any ordinary authority would be deemed almost extravagant, is taken from Tholuck's Commentary on John, Introduction, § 7, Krauth's translation: "The pointing of his fingers are sun-beams, and his hints gleams of lightning. When he treads the beaten path, what others employ wearisome pages in saying, he compresses into two or three words; often, too, through crag and forest he opens up new prospects."

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT.\*—We think it one of the infelicities of our religious nomenclature, that explanatory treatises on any of the books of the sacred canon, should have been styled *commentaries*. We should have much preferred some such title as exposition or interpretation, or any similar term, which would have defined more sharply the province of the exegete, so that the very definition itself should mark the boundaries within which he may exercise his art. A great deal depends on the title with which an author proposes to label his work; he himself is affected by this circumstance quite as much as his readers. The more definitive his title is, the more clear, compact, and vigorous his book will be. And this is why we think the term commentary, as designating exposition of Scripture, an infelicity. Under cover of the vague and elastic proposition to make *comments*, many exegetes, instead of having steadily adhered to the single aim of explaining the words of God, have riotously careered over the whole domain of research, speculation, and feeling, and spread before us a vast and unresolvable mass of rubbish, without form and void, industriously gathered up from every quarter under heaven, consisting of dreary disquisitions on the history and significance of an expletive in a dozen dialects, pieces of bandages from old Rabbinic mummies, mysterious references, unintelligible suggestions, and languid reminiscences of Conference meeting platitudes. What we want as a help in studying a particular book of Scripture is, neither philological dissertations, nor ambling commentaries, but a straight-forward, earnest, succinct, and, as far as possible, exhaustive elucidation, and that too in intelligible English, of the meaning of the sacred writers.

We do not remember that we ever felt more pride in being a book-worm than when we placed on our shelf the first volume of Alford's Greek Testament. In almost everything that marks the book, it pleases us. Here we have more than nine hundred closely printed pages of condensed research and commentary. Unlike most commentators, who, in a spirit of a stringent and emasculating criticism, laboriously strain out every gnat of a verbal difficulty, and yet voraciously swallow every camel of a theological problem, without even so much as a feeble attempt at dissection, Alford lays out his strength mainly on the points where students most need help, namely, on the difficult passages. Neither does he permit his profound learning, manifest on every page, to impede his movements, for he exerts his mental powers enough in the way of positive thinking to keep off that unwieldy obesity which has given such a slow and lumbering gait to

---

\* *The Greek Testament*; with a critically revised Text, a Digest of Various Readings, Marginal References to verbal and idiomatic usages; Prolegomena, and a critical and exegetical Commentary; for the use of theological students and ministers. By Henry Alford, B. D., Minister of Quebec Chapel, London, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In four volumes. Vol. I. containing the four Gospels. New-York: Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1859.



some of his erudite predecessors. We are glad to observe that in his readiness to grapple with the profoundest scriptural problems, his boldness does not tempt into the fields of irreverent speculation. His generalizations are often wide-spreading; but they are the generalizations of the disciple, not of the theorist. Not that we assent by any means to all of Alford's views. As is generally the case with men of strong minds, his errors, like his excellencies, are positive. We specially enter our caveat against his views of inspiration, and of the Sabbath ordinance, and we are inclined to think that he magnifies the difficulties of a formal harmony of the Gospels, particularly of the accounts of the appearance of our Lord after his resurrection. But in dissenting from what is ordinarily called the orthodox view, he has this merit: whatever his opinion is, he expresses it boldly and intelligibly, scorning to shield himself behind an equivocal.

This invaluable work demands a more elaborate notice than we can give it in this number. Its chief excellencies are compactly stated in the title-page. *First*, he has critically revised the text, and given it in full, and in admirable type. The revision has been made on what we conceive to be sound principles, and mainly in accordance with Griesbach's celebrated canons. *Second*, he has accompanied the text with an exhaustive digest of various readings, containing those of Schäfer, Lachman, and Tischendorf. The extreme value of this digest is apparent at a glance. For a trifling sum the student is furnished with all the original sources of information on this point. To give a slight indication of the indefatigable industry of Alford, we have taken the trouble to count up the manuscripts and ancient versions to which he has referred. Of the ancient MSS. there are thirty, of the cursive there are ninety-three, of the ancient versions of the New Testament forty-four. He has also comprised in the digest references to one hundred and thirty-three of the fathers and ancient Christian writers, from Clement of Rome to Zonaras of Constantinople. Let it not be said hereafter, that only Germany contains prodigies of Biblical erudition. This immense number of references has forced Alford to adopt numerous and unique abbreviations, which give to his digest the inscrutable aspect of an apothecary's recipe; but he has charitably furnished his uninitiated readers with explanations on pages 80 and 82 of his *Prolegomena*. *Third*, he has furnished the text with numerous marginal references, not to the *subject-matter* of the text, as in our English Bibles, but to *verbal and idiomatic usages*, which exhibit simultaneously with the text itself, the peculiarities and ἀπαξ λεγόμενα of the passage under consideration. These marginal references constitute a rich repository of critical materials. *Fourth*, There are seventy-two pages of *Prolegomena*, which exhibit extraordinary powers of compression, since they discuss with great thoroughness fundamental questions concerning the origin of the Gospels, their inspiration, their alleged discrepancies, the genuineness and authorship of each, together with its original language, date, object, style, and character. *Fifth*, he has subjoined to the text a critical and evangelical commentary, so that on the same page we have the revised text, an *apparatus criticus*, and an exposition. The commentary is what an exposition should be—intelligible, critical, spirited, sympathetic, and eminently Bengellian, since it is sententious, and generally exhibits the *punctum saliens*. We give a single instance. Speaking of the eighteen years of unrecorded life which Jesus spent at Nazareth (Luke xi. 51), he remarks: "We are apt to forget that it was during this time that much of the great work of the second Adam was done."

It is cheering in these days, when so many of our hermeneutists, either bedwarfed by a spirit of puerile and drivelling criticism, loiter in the outer courts to take the dimensions of the tabernacle, and mark the color of its



hangings, and count its pillars and its chapiters, its sockets, its fillets, and its pins, or distended by the tumefactions of a flatulent rationalism, do not hesitate to pass judgment on the skill of the Heavenly Architect, and even to propose an entire remodelling of the structure, to observe Henry Alford and a few other acknowledged sons of sanctified learning, reverently entering *within* the veil, "to behold the beauty of Jehovah, and to inquire in His temple." We do not know the exegete who more accurately answers to Melancthon's conception of a Biblical teacher; "*Omnis bonus Theologus et fidelis interpret doctrinae evelentis, necessario esse debet, primum grammaticus, deinde Dialecticus, denique TESTIS.*" G. D. B.

To the foregoing we subjoin the following contribution from an esteemed correspondent, whose initials will be at once recognized.—EDS. REVIEW.

EDITORS OF THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW :

A pastor, who for nearly forty years has been accustomed to the almost daily study of the Greek New Testament, first with such helps as Dr. Geo. Campbell's Four Gospels, and Dr. McKnight's Epistles, and since with Bloomfield's and Kuinoel's Notes, and others of kindred character, begs leave very honestly and earnestly to commend Alford's Greek Testament, the first volume of a very economical and beautiful edition of which has just been issued by the Harpers. It gives, as nearly as possible, a faultless text, in good, legible-sized Greek characters, which it is a comfort for even old eyes to read. Next there is furnished a very full digest of the various critical readings of the text, with the amount of authority for each one, adding vastly to the facility for a thorough and satisfactory solution of the interpretations which have been given. To these succeed valuable English notes, chiefly of an exegetical character, combining the hermeneutical skill of the Germans with the logical, sound common sense of the English. In this way the student reaches more readily the gist of what learning and reverent sober skill, in mastering difficulties, can furnish. While he will do well to call no man master, but rather exercise his own best judgment in interpreting these holy oracles, it must be a satisfaction to find made ready to his hand the apparatus of exhaustive examination, so that his mind may rest satisfied in having reached the ultimate point of inquiry. With such helps, and devout, daily, patient study, let me assure young pastors they may, with immense profit and enjoyment too, keep up and enlarge that familiarity with the original language of Christ and His Apostles, which they may have begun in their theological training. They will thus escape some reproach, and not a little remorse, justly experienced by those who in critical study of the sacred writings began well, but too early neglected to keep up a daily familiarity with such healthful and ennobling studies. R. B.

THOLUCK ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.\*—Ever since 1836, Dr. Tholuck's commentary on John has been accessible to the English reading public, in the Rev. Kaufman's translation of the fourth edition. But, in the interval between that date and the present, the distinguished author has been constantly correcting and enriching his work, with the aid of the whole scholarship of the age. The original work has now reached the seventh edition. The present translation has been made from the sixth, but has received important additions from the seventh. And of the result the translator says: "As this translation comprehends the whole of the sixth,

\* *Commentary on the Gospel of John.* By Dr. Augustus Tholuck. Translated by Charles P. Krauth, D.D. Smith, English & Co., 1859.

and so much of the seventh edition, it claims, in this combination, an advantage over either edition of the original, as in the seventh much of the most valuable matter of the sixth is omitted, under the supposition that the reader has access to the earlier editions."

We have not been able to compare Dr. Krauth's version with the German original, and cannot, therefore, pronounce an independent opinion of its merits. It claims to have been made with carefulness, and with the purpose of giving a full and faithful exposition of the author's meaning, even at the sacrifice, if need be, of the graces of style, and from such slight examination as we have been able to give the translation, we see no reason to doubt that a good measure of success has been reached.

Of the author of the original work, it is not necessary to say one word to any reader of this REVIEW in the way of formal introduction. Probably no living German's name has become a term of so familiar and reverent affection amongst American Christians as that of Tholuck. The martyr-spirit that he has manifested ever since his appointment, in 1826, to the professorship of dogmatics and exegesis at Halle, has justly endeared him to thousands in our American churches. He is almost universally regarded, amongst us, as possessing peculiar qualifications, both of mind and heart, to be the interpreter of him who "was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Merely from his writings, he is thought of as one who might be admitted to a companionship with John in privileged intimacy with the Saviour.

But, in order that one may *fully* appreciate his special fitness to be the expounder of "the Beloved Disciple," he should see and hear him in one of his oral lectures on the Gospel of John—should see him of the mild blue eye, of the broad (not high), thoughtful brow, of the upward glance, of the serenely meditative and intelligent expression—should hear his musical voice as, during a lecture of three fourths of an hour, he pours out a constant stream of rich and quickening discourse, as, for example, on the varieties of Christian character an element of heavenly bliss, a topic springing, under his hand, from the exegesis of the passage, "In my Father's house are many mansions."

As, however, not many can enjoy this privilege, they can make themselves partial compensation by the careful study of his commentary on the Gospel of John, which, by the enterprise of Messrs. Smith & English, is now accessible, with many of the latest touches of the author's hand, to the English reader.

OWEN ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.\*—Dr. Owen has brought to his task on the Gospel of Luke, a well-earned reputation for excellence as a commentator of the New Testament. This volume will, we think, enhance that reputation. It gives us the fruit of thorough study, combined with self-reliance. Whilst paying respectful attention to the suggestions of the most eminent *living* and *recent* commentators, Mr. Owen does not hesitate to express his dissent from them wherever independent judgments seem demanded. If there is any fault in this respect, it is in the too frequent *advertising* of his dissent from the opinions of others, a slight *parading* of his own views, particularly where they differ from Mr. Alford's. To this last named commentator almost every page of the volume before us gives evidence of indebtedness, an indebtedness amply acknowledged, indeed, by Mr. Owen, but seemingly in the exercise of a jealous and almost excessive guardianship of his own independence.

---

\* *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.* By John J. Owen, D.D. New-York: Leavitt & Allen, 1859.

The author's thorough scholarship, careful exegesis, logical thinking, and classical purity of language, as well as his religious earnestness, combine to commend this commentary as one of the very best of its kind. There is nothing of heaviness about it, nothing to repel the reader of taste and sentiment, but much to stimulate and gratify him. For such a reader the consulting of these pages will not be a task and duty, but a real intellectual enjoyment.

A praiseworthy feature of the volume is the use that has been made of the most modern researches in Palestine, and the lands of the Bible, particularly of Thompson's work, published by the Harpers, "The Land and the Book."

As an example of the author's discriminating, lively, and suggestive style of comment, take his remarks on ch. ix. 54: "It has been a matter of wonder with some that a person of so mild and sweet a disposition as John, could have made such a proposition as the one here recorded. But they mistake the temperament of John, as well as overlook the peculiar circumstances of the rejection of Jesus by these Samaritans. Not to insist on the ardent and impetuous disposition of these brethren, and their unbending resolution and energy of character, implied in the surname Boanerges, *Sons of Thunder*, no one can read the Epistles of John, without having the conviction forced upon him that their author was a prompt, decided, outspoken man, who would sacrifice himself and others, rather than that his Master should receive insult or harm. \* \* \* \* They (John and James) were exasperated at the churlishness of these Samaritans. The thought occurred to them that if the affront put upon Elijah by involuntary agents, who acted in obedience to their king, was visited by so speedy and terrific a punishment, how much more worthy of such a doom were these men who, of their own accord, had rejected One, to whom, on the Mount of Transfiguration, they had seen Elijah himself do homage." This passage is not only just as a comment on the transaction here recorded, but is valuable as showing to what good use the study of the temperaments and circumstances of the holy men of the Old and New Testaments may be turned. Much of misapprehension and injustice has been the fruit of the neglect of such study. On this particular point some very useful suggestions are given in Tholuck's essay on the "Life and Writings of Paul," to which, as well as to Tholuck's work on John, Mr. Owen is manifestly indebted. This particular element has long seemed to us of much importance in the practical exposition of the Word of God, viz.: the study of temperaments.

Mr. Owen has allowed himself considerable latitude in the way of special discussions on particular passages, as, for example, on chapters xxiv. 39, and xxiii. 43, where we find an admirable handling of the question of the Descent of Christ into Hell, with an incidental and just interpretation of the controverted passage, 1 Peter iii. 18, 19. These special discussions are neither too frequent nor too long, for they are on important topics, and are pursued generally with excellent judgment and temper, to satisfactory results.

We feel constrained to differ from the author, as well as to criticise his method, in his interpretation of xxii. 44, where, as in many other places, he seems to take pains to put his opinions in pointed opposition to those of Mr. Alford. We think, with the last named commentator, that the *bloody sweat* is rather required to be held on critical grounds. And we feel disposed to call on Mr. Owen to retract the offensive remark that "It is the desire to improve on the original record which has induced many modern interpreters to refer this sweat to real blood." Such motive no one Christian scholar has a right to impute to another. We agree, however, with Mr. Owen that the bloody sweat is not to be held on the ground of any example



in the medical records of the race. We believe the awfully mysterious fact stands by itself, unique, separating the sufferings of our Saviour from all other human suffering.

But our purpose is not to criticise, but simply to notice this volume. To the classes for whom it was prepared, ministers, theological students, teachers in Sunday Schools, &c., we warmly commend it. It will shed on their reading of the Sacred page an unusually harmonious blending of the lights of learning and religious experience.

NEWTON ON DANIEL.\*—There can be no doubt but that the subject of Eschatology, as the consummation of prophecy, is just now engaging an unusual amount of serious thought and searching inquiry. The subject is not likely to diminish in interest. Many consenting signs indicate to holy watchers that we are rapidly approaching "the time of the end," that most important and startling changes lie in a not remote future. We may therefore expect an accomplishment of the words of Daniel spoken concerning "the time of the end," "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased;" "run to and fro," that is, in searching, with an unprecedented zeal of exegetical labor, the various portions of prophetic scripture; run to and fro amongst the pages of the Word of God, "searching what, and what manner of time" the Spirit in the prophet, signified in its testimony concerning the kingdom of God. All works therefore, written on this subject, with prayerful, patient, sober research in the diligent comparison of Scripture with Scripture, by the application of the settled canons of interpretation, should be received with welcome greeting, and examined with care and candor.

The two works placed at the head of this notice are written, each, in the full strength of earnest convictions. But they are quite different in character. The first was delivered originally in a series of oral lectures, to a Christian congregation, and appears in a form suitable for popular address. For the greater part only the results of exegesis are given. The second claims a much more rigidly scientific and critical character. It professes, indeed, to be the fruit of an exhaustive exegesis of the New Testament testimony on the subject of discussion. And we have heard that something of a sensation has been produced by it in certain localities. Whether this sensation be the effect of any novelties of interpretation introduced into the work, or of any apparent audacity and vigor in the assailing of old opinions, we are not informed.

These two volumes need to be reviewed in connection with a discussion of the general subject with which they deal. For this review and discussion we have no space in the present number. But we propose to ourselves the accomplishment of the task in our next issue. Till then we shall dismiss the volumes with the simple remark, that the first named falls into the oft-repeated error of calculating definitely the chronological numbers given in the Apocalypse, and the second runs a-tilt at the almost universal creed, by maintaining that for each human being the coming of the Lord, the resurrection, and the final judgment, are strictly contemporary with his death.

KURTZ ON THE OLD COVENANT.†—Dr. Kurtz is well and favorably

\* *Lectures on Daniel.* By Wm. Newton. Wm. S. & Alfred Martien, Philadelphia, 1859.

*Eschatology.* By Samuel Lee. Boston: J. E. Tilton. 1859.

† *History of the Old Covenant.* From the German of J. H. Kurtz, D. D., Prof. of Theology at Dorpat. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; Phila.: Smith, English & Co. 1859.



known in this country, by means of the translation of two of his works, viz., "The Manual of Sacred History," and "The Bible and Astronomy." The latter work has been regarded by many as one of the most successful attempts at harmonizing the Mosaic account of the creation with the ascertained facts of geology and astronomy. It certainly is one of the least dogmatic and most reverent attempts in that direction. A condensed abstract of this work, exhibiting clearly all its essential positions, occupies the first 130 pages of the volume before us, and for such as have not the full work, will be of much value as an introduction to the special discussions in the History of the Old Covenant. The starting point of that history is God's entering into covenant with Abraham; the termination is the "objective exhibition of salvation by the incarnation of God in Christ." The present volume brings us only to Joseph's elevation, and the making himself known to his brethren (Gen. xlv.) Two volumes more are expected to complete the survey.

The author's name is a sufficient guarantee of the scholarly and the evangelical qualities of his work. Dr. Kurtz belongs to that better, and now somewhat numerous class of German theologians, who are bringing to the investigation and illustration of the Bible, along with the amplest resources of genuine learning and thorough research, a sincere faith in the Old and New Testaments, as the inspired and authoritative word of God. As might be expected, therefore, the "History of the Old Covenant" not only furnishes on every page awakening, suggestive, and instructive thoughts, but also furnishes specimens of thorough dealing with religious skepticism, in its questionings of the genuineness or truthfulness of the Scripture records.

NEANDER'S COMMENTARIES.\*—This is a new edition of the practical Commentaries of Neander, uniform with Olshausen. Neander, as is well known, has not here expended his strength on the minutiae of philology, but has unfolded the apostolic teachings in their special connection with the Christian life and a personal faith in the Redeemer. They are commentaries which all Christians can read with profit. The skill of Mrs. Conant as translator is already well known to the public.

## II.

SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S LECTURES ON METAPHYSICS.†—These lectures were for twenty years (1836—'56), the author's class-room prelections in the University of Edinburgh. We hail their republication in this country with special satisfaction. While they contain nothing essentially new to one who has been a careful reader of the "Philosophical Discussions" and the "Dissertations," they will yet be of invaluable service to all who, from any cause, have failed to understand their author's philosophical opinions. The publication and circulation of the lectures in this country will doubtless be followed by a perceptible and healthful quickening of our intellectual life, and it is to be hoped be a final check to that presumptuous

\* *Dr. Augustus Neander's Scriptural Expositions of the First Epistle of John, the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians, and the General Epistle of James.* Translated from the German by Mrs. H. C. Conant. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.

† *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic.* By Sir William Hamilton, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, &c., &c. Edited by the Rev. Henry L. Mansel, B. D., Oxford, and John Veitch, M. A. Edinburgh. In two vols. Vol. I., *Metaphysics.* Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

philosophy which reasons of the absolute and "absolute personality" as if we were omniscient. We fully believe the editors of this volume when they assert that Sir William "exercised over the intellects and feelings of his pupils an influence which, for depth, intensity, and elevation, was certainly never surpassed by that of any philosophical instructor," and we only hope that a like influence over other minds, may, in some degree, be perpetuated by the publication of his lectures. Marked everywhere by the marvellous learning, the acumen, the force, and breadth of their author, they yet were composed for oral instruction, and are level to all ordinary capacities. We should be glad to know that the publishers were being remunerated for their outlay by a general introduction of the volume into our colleges as a text book.

It has been to us a matter of surprise that the contributions of Sir William Hamilton to metaphysical science should have hitherto received so little attention in our American colleges. We know of but *one* college in the country in which they have been regularly examined in the lecture-room, but in that one they have been introduced for class recitations, and, as we happen to know, with the happiest results. It is remarkable, that among the swarm of college text-books in this science, published within the past few years, scarcely one recognizes, and not one so discusses the real issues—the vital questions—involved in existing philosophical controversies, as to furnish a safeguard to young men who may afterwards be initiated into the mysteries of either of the German schools of Pantheism.

It would be superfluous to attempt in this notice either an enumeration or an analysis of even Hamilton's main principles, as we have engaged a competent hand to furnish for our pages a thorough and careful exposition of his whole system, so far as it may be gathered from all that he has written.

**MANSEL'S LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.\***—We had intended for our readers a formal review of these admirable lectures in the present number, but are compelled to wait till another issue. Meanwhile we wish to say that they deal with the modern school of skeptics, in the only effective method yet adopted. We have been out of patience at the attempted replies to Theodore Parker by our American writers, and none the less so at the latest attempts by Dr. Bushnell in his "Nature and the Supernatural," and Prof. Wharton in his "Theism and Skepticism." As we said in our last number, Dr. Bushnell's metaphysics incapacitate him for such service. English and Scotch authors (with the exception of Buchanan in his "Modern Atheism") have done but little better. From the publication of Mr. Mansel's "Bampton Lectures" will date a new era in apologetics. In these lectures the intelligent reader requires but a few pages to assure him that he is under the guidance of a clear-seeing and powerful intellect. Mr. Mansel wastes no words on side issues, but discloses at once the very foundation of Pantheistic skepticism, and proceeds to overturn them. He shows that the superstructure reared upon them is only a tissue of false criticisms on subjects immeasurably beyond the reach of finite faculties. His aim is simply a critical destruction of a destructive criticism, and he makes thorough work. Having very distinctly stated his purpose and aim, he shows that an intelligible conception of the Absolute and Infinite, which modern skepticism assumes, is an impossibility; he then, with

---

\* *The Limits of Religious Thought Examined, in eight lectures, delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1848, on the Bampton Foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D. First American, from the third London edition, with the notes translated.* Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

remarkable clearness of analysis, exhibits the general conditions of all human consciousness, from which by irresistible logic he concludes that "thought cannot be the measure of belief;" he then gives an analysis of our religious consciousness, from which he proves that our religious knowledge must be *regulative* and not *speculative*; the distinction between regulative and speculative knowledge is then tested and supported by analogies; in lectures six and seven the principles previously settled are applied to various doctrines and requirements of Revelation; the whole discussion closing in lecture eight, with a clear and forcible exposition of the "right use of reason in religious questions." But no just conception of the masterly treatment of the whole subject, can be given to any one who has not read the lectures.

Mr. Mansel's book, however, will not in this country command the assent of even all believers in a Divine Revelation. The two extremes of rationalizing socinianism and mystical ecclesiasticism, that have united so harmoniously in endorsement of such a book as "Nature and the Supernatural," will not look complacently on another so antipodal in its fundamental principles as the "Bampton Lectures; and intellects bold enough to reason out a "Rational Cosmology" from *à priori* principles, quietly telling us what must be the method and laws of the Infinite mind, will not tamely submit to be told that they cannot sound the Absolute or measure the Infinite. But Mr. Mansel's method will survive assaults, and we are confident, furnish our only effective weapons for the destruction of that pretentious structure of modern unbelief, now sheltering so many shades of skeptics, but resting on the shadowy foundations of mere assumption and misconceptions. To every thinking man at all interested in the skeptical opinions now circulating among us, be he skeptic or believer, we would say emphatically, read the lectures of Mr. Mansel. Of the translation of the notes from various languages, by Prof. Lincoln, of Brown University, it is but just to say, that he has performed his task with rare success.

WHARTON'S THEISM AND SKEPTICISM.\*—The object of Prof. Wharton in preparing this volume, as we learn from the preface, was "to present the Theistic argument and the replies to the prominent skeptical theories in such a shape as the best to impress the American mind of the present day." In executing this design, the author has discussed many of the most important philosophical questions connected with the establishment of the main positions of Theism, and has given to these discussions a form which must render them both attractive and serviceable to not a few who would be repelled from the more scientific and thorough examinations which are found in such recent treatises as those of Buchanan and Mansel. No other philosophical work with which we are acquainted seems so well adapted as this to reach and benefit a certain class of young men in our institutions of learning and elsewhere, and we commend it to the attention of all who are interested in opposing the spread of religious skepticism in its manifold forms.

It is evident, however, that the *special* adaptation of the work to the wants of those who are in no danger of having their religious beliefs affected by the higher forms of metaphysical speculation, must, necessarily, impair its value, for a smaller, yet perhaps more important class of the American people. To those whose skeptical opinions and tendencies are due, mainly, to the more profound speculative difficulties inherent in the Theistic scheme of belief, this treatise can be of but little benefit, for it

---

\* *A Treatise on Theism, and on the Modern Skeptical Theories.* By Francis Wharton, Prof. in Kenyon College, Ohio. Phila.: J. B. Lippincott & Co.



is manifestly wanting in what such minds imperatively demand, viz.: a thorough examination of fundamental principles and a critical estimate of the value of the various Theistic arguments.

DR. THOMPSON ON THE CHRISTIAN GRACES.\*—In book-making, *magnitude* and *merit* are not convertible terms, else this volume would have an humble place in the religious literature of our times. A duodecimo of 280 pages comprises the author's meditations on the Christian graces.

It is refreshing to take such a volume as this in hand, so scholarly is it in the handling of the inspired text, so just and thorough in its analyses, so rich in suitable illustration, so choice and classic in language, so unaffectedly pious in utterance. Why, we have said to ourselves as we have read these lectures, and have felt convinced that they are specimens of Mr. Thompson's pulpit ministrations, why do not our pastors, one and all, subject themselves to the self-tasking, the mental gymnastics of which every page and paragraph of these discourses gives evidence?

Of course, we heartily commend the volume to our readers. They will find their account in reading it. They will be edified and quickened thereby. For, Mr. Thompson is not only a man of wide and generous reading, but also of manly thought. Withal, his lectures are sufficiently practical to come home to every class of readers, in whatever relation of life.

THE GREAT CONCERN. BY NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D.†—This volume consists of six discourses, which were preached, and printed in tract form, during the revival in 1857-8. They are on Instantaneous conversion; Justification, and its consequences; Our Bible; Scriptural argument for future, endless punishment; Reasonableness of future, endless punishment; God is Love. Dr. Adams writes in an easy, graceful, winning style, which holds the reader to his pages; though, to our minds, he is not a model sermonizer. The sound doctrinal teachings of his discourses, must have been eminently serviceable during the mental quickening that prevailed in the months in which they were delivered. There are, however, a few points of doctrine from which we should demur. Thus, in the discourse on "God is Love," the whole aim is to show that "Love rules in the Divine perfections," that is, that Love is "the predominant manifestation in the Divine character, and makes the predominant impression upon our minds." We regard this as erroneous. Love doubtless qualifies, and is qualified by every other attribute; but if there be a "predominant manifestation" of either perfection, we hold it is not of love, but of holiness. This is the attribute that predominates in the Law, in the whole Jewish economy, in all angelic announcements and antiphonies, in the cross of Christ, and in the minds of both the convicted sinner and the rejoicing saint. Christianity is a revelation of the Divine Love, but of that love illumined and made persuasive by a surrounding and more impressive revelation of the Divine Holiness.

A NEW VOLUME OF SPURGEON'S SERMONS.‡—This new volume of the

---

\* *The Christian Graces; a Series of Lectures on 2d Pet. i. 5-12.* By Rev. Joseph P. Thompson. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.

† *The Great Concern; or, Man's Relation to God and a Future State.* By Nehemiah Adams, D. D., pastor of the Essex-street Church, Boston. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

‡ *Sermons Preached and Revised by the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. Fifth Series.* New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.



indefatigable Spurgeon, is in no way inferior to the preceding, and differs from them only in presenting the great truths of the Gospel, in new and ever varying illustrations.

DR. BOMBERGER ON INFANT SALVATION AND BAPTISM.\*—This is a small book written to show that "little children, who die in infancy are saved in heaven;" that there "is a *present renewal of the nature of the child in Christ Jesus by the Holy Ghost*," which is formally secured by baptism, and it is absurd as well as unscriptural, irrational as well as wrong, to refuse baptism to infants presented by Christian parents, or other suitable persons, willing to assume the responsibility! The italics as well as exclamation point, are the author's.

This astonishing feat of argumentation, is accomplished in four propositions, headed: 1. Infant Depravity; 2. The Necessity of Infant Regeneration; 3. Infant Salvation by Christ; 4. Infant Baptism. The reader will notice the substitution, in the 3d, of the word salvation for regeneration. This, as well as other parts of the book, is significant enough of the author's notion of the connection of regeneration with baptism.

We do not remember to have seen in the same number of pages so much apparent strength combined with so much real weakness; so much show of logic, and so many false inferences and flat contradictions. The author asserts broadly, that all infants are "inimical to holiness." "Even the children of the most exemplary parents do not prove exceptions to this rule," page 24; and yet explicitly declares that "an infant unresistingly allows a new principle of life to be combined with its being," page 108; and "every little child receives the kingdom of heaven," page 108. Again, infants do not "perish under the new covenant, for non-conformity with a law—as that of baptism—of which they are not only ignorant, but which is entirely beyond their reach," page 126; and yet the "present renewal of the nature of the child, in Christ Jesus by the holy Ghost, is formally secured by baptism," page 179. Every infant is depraved, and yet every one is regenerate; every one is formally renewed by baptism, and yet the children of the most exemplary are no exceptions to the universal depravity. We had marked for notice several arguments in support of particular positions, but doubt if they are worth the space they would occupy. We commend the book to our high church brethren, both Episcopal and Presbyterian, as "a valuable addition to their practical theology."

This little book is a very hopeful sign in one respect. It is a revelation of a steadily growing conviction on the part of Pedobaptists, that infant sprinkling is unscriptural and unwarrantable. It says: "statistics have been published recently, which exhibit a state of things well calculated to grieve and alarm those who have any zeal for one of the plainest doctrines of the Bible, (infant baptism) and that a doctrine upon the maintenance of which depends, in a great measure, our appreciation of the atonement of Jesus Christ!" Baptists then do not "appreciate the atonement of Jesus Christ," and infant baptism is one of the plainest doctrines in the Bible. This is instructive.

DR. HOVEY'S STATE OF THE IMPENITENT DEAD.†—This is a succinct

---

\* *Infant Salvation in its Relation to Infant Depravity, Infant Regeneration, and Infant Baptism.* By J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.

† *The State of the Impenitent Dead.* By Alvah Hovey, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

but able defence of the doctrine of the everlasting consciousness and misery of the impenitent dead. It is intended to be a reply to the principal arguments of Hudson, in his "Doctrine of a Future Life," a treatise supporting the theory, that immortality is by the grace of Christ, and for Christians only. Dr. Hovey's discussion is very unpretending, as compared with Mr. Hudson's, and yet, as respects the scriptural argument, (on which the whole controversy must actually turn,) is incomparably its superior, both in breadth and in accuracy.

The subject was first examined by Dr. Hovey, in the discharge of his official duties in the lecture room, and it is "at the request of Christian brethren," that the results of his inquiries are now given to the public. This will account for the scholastic air that pervades the discussion, a peculiarity that could have been removed only by a circumlocution and expansion that, while procuring a wider range of readers, would have lessened its effectiveness with those for whom the volume was specially prepared. Prof. Hovey has also confined himself to a comparatively limited range of argument. He has written for educated men, who wish to examine at once the foundations of a doctrine, and can construct outside buttresses to suit themselves. An extended and more popular treatise is perhaps still desirable.

The book is divided into seven sections; the first treats of Body and Soul, showing the corruptibility of the one and the incorruptibility of the other; the second, on Death and Life, showing these terms to be applicable principally to the soul; the third, treats of the intermediate state and consciousness therein; fourth, of the final state; fifth, and sixth, and seventh, consider Biblical and other objections. The book is worth a careful reading by all who have to deal with the error it combats.

WALLER ON OPEN COMMUNION.\*—So long as Baptists stand firm to their present Scriptural and self-consistent views of the restrictions by which admission to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is to be hedged about; so long as they maintain their just position in regard to the mutual relation of the two Christian ordinances, so long will they be charged with bigotry, and so long will they be under the necessity of defending themselves by means of apologies, written in the form of answers to polemical attacks. This species of warfare will not end in our day, and Baptists may as well make up their minds to stand to their guns. The position they occupy is heroic, for it is a conscientious wrestling for the integrity and purity of Christ's appointments, and for the proper composition and discipline of Christ's Church.

In maintaining this "fight of faith" we know of no section of our denominational heritage more gallant than the South and Southwest. And we honor the zeal and the martial spirit of our brethren, and would do nothing needlessly to check their enthusiasm. But we venture to make one fraternal suggestion, and that is that they temper their acknowledged "fortiter in re," with a little more of the "suaviter in modo."

Dr. Waller was a writer of the Boanerges kind. A man of strong convictions and earnest utterance, he went beyond the defensive, and "carried the war into Africa" in an onset of unsparing severity against what he honestly regarded as an unscriptural and deleterious practice, a practice whose tendency is to break down the ordinance of baptism. His work will be read with interest, and will secure the assent of the denomination

---

\* *Open Communion shown to be Unscriptural and Deleterious.* By John L. Waller, LL. D.; with an *Introductory Essay* by D. R. Campbell, LL. D., &c., &c. Louisville, Ky.: G. W. Robertson, Baptist Book Concern, 1859. New-York: Sheldon & Co.

to its main positions, particularly the position that the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is a memorial of Christ's death, and not a test of Christian fellowship.

### III.

FROM WALL STREET TO CASHMERE.\*—This is a ponderous book of travels, "taken," as the author tells us, "from a continuous journal, in letters to his mother, and of course reliable from the very nature of the journal." Mr. Ireland traveled "in a comfortable, gentlemanly way, neither extravagant nor stinting himself," passing leisurely over a large portion of the earth's surface, and visiting the most attractive regions on the three continents of the old world. His book embodies his impressions and his experiences. In free and easy, and often careless and inelegant English, it tells how he traveled, when he started and stopped, where he slept, what he ate, what he saw and what he did. A single initial of names of persons innumerable, with whom he dined and supped, are scattered throughout the volume, forming details, which, accompanied by real names, were doubtless full of interest to mother and friends, but to the uninitiated reader, are anything but attractive. Though not written for the scientific or the scholarly, the pages of Mr. Ireland, particularly his accounts of Cashmere and the "scenes of the recent mutinies in India," will interest a large class of readers. The "nearly one hundred illustrations, from sketches made on the spot by the author," give vividness to his descriptions.

MR. FIELD'S SUMMER PICTURES.†—This is a book of travels, not differing widely from the preceding. Though, like that, first written in the form of letters, it yet covers less months of travels than that does years, is confined to the scenes and cities of Europe, and everywhere breathes the spirit of a man of taste and of letters. The author is a brother of Cyrus W. Field, lately so famous from his connection with the Atlantic telegraph, and whom he had the unexpected pleasure of meeting at Falmouth, just before the sailing of the steamers on their great errand. Summer Pictures is a happy and truthful title. Taken in summer, a summer atmosphere, with the fragrance of a genial spirit everywhere pervades them. The author heard Dickens read his Christmas Carol; heard Spurgeon preach; went to Paris, thence to Holland and on to Denmark; crossed the Baltic; visited Berlin, Dresden, Prague, Vienna, Venice, Verona, Milan, and came over the Alps, at whose hither base he "ends his traveller's tale." A very pleasant book for a summer day's reading, and withal unusually attractive in its paper, type, and entire mechanical execution.

THE BIBLE IN THE LEVANT.‡—We have in this volume an affectionate tribute to the memory of a genial companion in travel, and a zealous, though short-lived, laborer in a department of Foreign Mission work. The

---

\* *From Wall Street to Cashmere: A Journal of Five Years in Asia, Africa, and Europe, &c., &c., &c.* By John B. Ireland. With nearly one hundred illustrations, from sketches made on the spot by the author. New-York: S. A. Rollo & Co. 1859.

† *Summer Pictures: From Copenhagen to Venice.* By Henry M. Field, author of *the Irish Confederates and the Rebellion of 1798*. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.

‡ *The Bible in the Levant; or the Life and Letters of Rev. C. N. Righter.* By Samuel Irenæus Prime. N. Y.: Sheldon & Co. 1859.



larger part of the story is told in the letters of Mr. Righter, sent to his friends from the field of his travel and labor. These letters give somewhat interesting sketches of the objects he saw, the customs with which he became acquainted, and the important persons to whom he was introduced. But, though everywhere betraying a conscientious pursuit of duty, they give no indications of that burning missionary zeal that so fires the soul in reading the memoirs of Martyn, and Brainard, and Swartz, and many other modern Missionaries. We shall not look for any new recruits for the foreign service as the fruits of this Memoir.

Nor do the letters of Mr. Righter prepare the reader to expect any such ecstasies of religious experience as appear to have been vouchsafed to him on his death-bed. In his journal there is scarcely a trace of introversion; scarcely a word that reveals his inner life. From the objectivity of all his communications one is at a loss to account for the closing scenes of his pilgrimage,—not unlike those of Payson's death.

The editor's task has cost him evidently but little mental agony. It must be a gift that "comes by nature," quite beyond the reach of art, to be able to produce a book of 336 pages with so little expenditure of original resource. And yet, as an editor the author of this volume is second, perhaps, to no other man amongst us for vigor, effectiveness, and usefulness. But he lacks the *constructive* talent that successfully builds the enduring volume, if we may judge from this specimen.

#### IV.

STANLEY'S SINAI AND PALESTINE.\*—This is a new issue, by a new publishing house, of a well-known book, and one of the very best of the many that have been written on the Holy Land. It differs essentially, both in conception and in execution, from all similar works. Its aim is to "illustrate the relation in which the History and the Geography of the chosen people stand to each other," and "to exhibit the effect of the 'Holy Land' on the 'Holy History.'" And Mr. Stanley has done all that learning, including the results of previous laborers in the same field, and careful personal inspection, can do to help us to read the Bible in the light of the natural scenery amid which its events and conversations occurred; and to make intelligible to us the intimate connection of the character of the chosen people with the conformations of their country. A most valuable book—an eminently useful one to all students of the Bible and preachers of the Gospel—is the result. If we could possess but one of the many modern books on Palestine, we think it should be Mr. Stanley's.

THE PRECIOUS STONES OF THE HEAVENLY FOUNDATIONS, BY MRS. GARRETT.†—A book partly prose, partly verse, both original and selected. The whole volume consists, in the language of the preface, of "a series of reflections on some of the figurative external beauties of the Heavenly City." The successive chapters are "brief discussions on the twelve precious stones engraven with the names of the twelve Apostles, with remarks on the most accredited signification of them, with appropriate texts of Scripture." Amongst the extracts are passages from eminent Christian authors. These, as well as the original contributions, refer almost exclusively to the future life. Many of them are exquisitely beautiful, all are elevated in tone, and morally wholesome.

\* *Sinai and Palestine, in Connection with their History.* By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, M. A., Canon of Canterbury. With Maps and Plates. New-York: Blakeman & Mason.

† *The Precious Stones of the Heavenly Foundations.* By Augusta Brown Garrett. New-York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.



We are free to say that we rarely meet, in a volume of such moderate compass, so many really "*beautiful* waifs." The perfume of a pure Christian sentiment is in every page. There are single pieces, both original and selected, worth the price of the volume. Take, for example, the quaintly pious, song-breathing contribution, attributed to Bishop Ken, "The Pilgrim's Farewell to the World," page 145. Or, take the unabridged, glorious old song, page 323, "Jerusalem, my happy Home."

The authoress may felicitate herself on having written and compiled a volume which not only has character, but in which there is not, probably, a single line that she will ever wish stricken out. Nothing but good can come of reading such a book.

MOORE ON ANCIENT MINERALOGY.\*—By the term "Mineralogy" in this treatise, is not intended a strictly scientific classification and arrangement of the substances embraced in the mineral kingdom; certainly not any such comprehensive, not to say exhaustive, arrangement as has been achieved by the mineralogists of the present century. The treatise is confined to "an inquiry respecting mineral substances mentioned by the ancients, with occasional remarks on the uses to which they were applied." Even thus, however, a rich and interesting field of investigation is opened, and the author has wrought in it with the genuine enthusiasm of classic scholarship. The result is a volume of very modest pretension, but replete with entertainment and instruction.

In conducting his inquiry, the author takes the mineralogical portion of the last five books of *Pliny's* Natural History as a basis, and weaves into a sort of comment on the text matter that he finds in *Theophrastus*, *Dioscorides*, and other ancient scientific writers, illustrating the whole by contributions gleaned from a wide range of reading amongst the poets and historians of antiquity. In this commentary he includes the substance of the mineralogy of the Bible.

We are admonished, in reading this volume, that whilst in the *science* of mineralogy the moderns are incomparably superior to the ancients, yet in the *art* of working and using the mineral substances, the ancients sometimes reached a perfection of skill that fairly defies all modern competition. Less busy than we are with the abstractions and generalizations of science, the ancients gave all their thought and manual dexterity to the concrete embodiment of their conceptions and feelings in the various productions of art. And into what faultless and unapproachable forms they wrought the substances with which they experimented, a few pediments from the Parthenon, a Venus de Medici, a Diana Venatrix, and an Apollo Belvidere, still remain to bear witness.

THE PILLAR OF FIRE, BY INGRAHAM.†—Mr. Ingraham is, in one respect at least, a successful author. He writes books that are sold and read by the thousand. And there are some intrinsic excellences in his volumes concerning which he is entitled to our congratulations. There is much vivacity of style, considerable range of language, and some dramatic power. Nor do his pages lack marks of diligence in investigation, and labor in composition. But at this point we think all just praise ends. The work is not true to the facts of history, and therefore its acknowledged merits cannot, and could not, were they ten-fold greater than they

\* *Ancient Mineralogy.* By N. T. Moore, LL. D. Second edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.

† *The Pillar of Fire; Or Israel in Bondage.* By Rev. J. H. Ingraham. New-York: Putney & Russell. 1859.

are, save it from condemnation. The story of Moses, as told by Mr. Ingraham, is unhistorical and utterly improbable. And if *such* fiction, such an unconscionable violation of all historical probability, was necessary to the composition of the work, the work better never have been written. Rather than accept the author's pearls on such a thread, the world might well forego the possession of the pearls. Does Mr. Ingraham believe his own representation of the deep ignorance of Moses till manhood, concerning the true God? or, has he persuaded himself of the credibility of any of the related adventures and incidents by which he came to that knowledge? There is a limit to allowable license in all historical fictions: Mr. I. has entirely lost sight of it.

To questions of Egyptian archæology, and particularly to the question of chronology in connection with Egyptian history, the author has, apparently given considerable attention, and he has professedly adopted the system which we are inclined to think is proximately true. It is the theory that has been wrought out, after *Spohn*, by *Seyffarth* and *Uhlemann*, and, according to our author, was substantially adopted by *Nolan*. If, however, Nolan adopted the same general theory of the above-named authorities, he differed from them in regard to the date of the transactions woven into this work no less than nearly three hundred years, our author giving the date of the birth of Moses, after Nolan we suppose, as 1560, B. C., and Seyffarth and Uhlemann putting it at 1947, B. C. This latter date, we repeat, seems to us to be proximately the true one, though on this point we have a large array of authorities against us. But those authorities, of whom it is sufficient to mention *Bunsen*, have been subjected of late to damaging criticism—criticism apparently as just as it is searching. The whole subject is, however, *sub judice*, and we wait for the light of further investigation before pronouncing very positive or confident opinions.

On p. 294-5 our author seems to adopt the theory of the antediluvian origin of the earliest pyramids. But this is not necessary with the system of chronology that he professes to receive.

The solving of the enigma of the Phoenix, ch. 17, a solution that commends itself as rational, is copied quite literally from Seyffarth.

The work will be extensively read; but such as read it with indiscriminate faith will get only distorted views of important history.

**THE NEW PRIEST.\***—This is the most noteworthy work of fiction that has been issued from the American press, for a long time. The scene is laid in Newfoundland, a country socially and geographically unknown to the majority of readers in the States. Conception Bay, one of the fingers which the sea runs up among the piny locks of their island daughter, has been chosen by the author, for the development of his plot. The inhabitants are an amphibious people, living as much on the sea as on the land, honest, shrewd, sturdy, and of primitive simplicity in mode of life. Two of the prominent characters, one, perhaps, the finest in the book, and most of the subordinate actors, belong to this class of humble fishermen. A concentrated Yankee, a crafty Jesuit, and an easy-going priest, a clear-seeing, loving woman, and the "new priest" himself, first a pervert and then a convert, are the other principal characters. The plot is based upon the mutual antagonism of Protestantism and Papacy. The author is a graphic word painter, and has an artist's eye for the picturesque, both in nature and humanity. The rugged terraqueous scenery of New-

---

\* *The New Priest in Conception Bay*. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1858.

foundland, the unique type of character found there, the peculiar dialect, the uncertain relation of friends in heart and foes in creed, furnish material which he has worked up with a skilful pen. The book abounds in passages of the deepest pathos, revealing the most hidden workings of the human heart. As a work of art, the "New Priest," must be said to lack unity. Two stories of almost equal interest, and only incidentally connected, run through the book. Its title might almost as appropriately have been "The Lost Daughter," as the "New Priest." When we have said this, and that the author sometimes writes a little too leisurely, retarding the progress of the story, we have no farther criticism to make on a novel of original and most striking merit.

THE BERTRAMS.\*—The *moral* of this story is, the short-sightedness and folly of allowing the mercenary spirit, or the spirit of selfishness and pride, to control the arrangement of the voluntary relations of life, particularly that one which is the most sacred of all human relations.

The *plot* unfolds itself in a way so natural, with so little that is startling and unexpected in the development, that one, in reading, is scarcely disposed to give the volume any credit for fiction at all; is almost dissatisfied that there is so little of the romantic, not to say improbable. The scenes and events, the incidents and coincidences which one meets with in these pages, are really such as are likely enough to happen in the ordinary life of the persons introduced to our notice.

And those persons are nowise remarkable beyond many persons we have known in the different circles and classes they represent. The plot the scenes, the characters, have a naturalness and a lifelikeness that seem almost inappropriate in a work with the title of novel.

And then, the language in which the author draws his scenes, describes his characters, and develops his plot, is really such as ordinary mortals, with a fair measure of education, can understand. And, withal, the Anglo-Saxon element predominates in our author's vocabulary. There is, in short, a refreshing *naturalness* in the style of the volume.

One might infer from what we have said that a work of fiction like this, introducing persons nowise remarkable, discoursing of them and causing them to talk with each other in style and manner level to the common intelligence, must be almost necessarily dull. The fact is quite otherwise. The reader's interest in the story continues unabated to the end. And the catastrophe presents us with that mixture of sorrow and bliss that makes it true to the experiences of life.

The moral and religious tone of the book is, for the greater part, unexceptionable, we may say healthful. We are sorry, however, to find in chap. 26, in a conversation of the half-fledged skeptic, Mr. Bertram, with a young clergyman, that the best of the argument is given to the skeptic. Surely, the advocate of evangelical Christianity should have been made to argue more logically and conclusively.

THE MOTHERS OF THE BIBLE.†—This is one of the best of a poor kind of books. The lady who wrote it, we have no doubt greatly profited by the reflections here embodied; and these again may carry light and comfort to many another anxious and praying mother. The danger of this class of books on Bible persons is over-coloring, and the fancying of what never occurred. It is questionable how far they promote the study of the Bible itself.

---

\* *The Bertrams; a Novel.* By the Author of "Dr. Thorne." New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.

† *The Mothers of the Bible.* By Mrs. S. G. Ashton. With an Introductory Essay by Rev. A. L. Stone. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.



IGDRASIL; OR, THE TREE OF EXISTENCE.\*—The author of this poem has been fortunate in his choice of subject for poetic treatment, or, at least, in the point of observation from which he views it. And in this last particular he has been fortunate in being helped to a point of view from which to take a grandly poetic survey of his theme. It is, a great "coigne of vantage" for one who would sing the mysteries and meanings of existence, to be placed at such a commanding elevation of thought and emotion, as that on which the eloquent passage from Carlyle places him; certainly one of the most eloquent and soul-moving paragraphs of that great writer. We are irresistibly tempted, by its chaste and marvellous beauty of thought and language, to transfer it entire to our pages. "I like, too, that representation they have of the tree Igdrasil. All life is figured by them as a tree. Igdrasil—the Ash Tree of Existence—has its roots down in the kingdom of Hela, or death; its trunk reaches up heaven-high, spreads its boughs over the whole universe: it is the tree of existence. At the foot of it, in the death-kingdom, sit three Normas—Fates—the Past, Present, Future, watering its roots from the sacred well. Its boughs, with their buddings and disleafings—events, things suffered, things done, catastrophes—stretch through all lands and times. Is not every leaf of it a biography, every fibre there an act, a word? Its boughs are histories of nations. The rustle of it is the noise of human existence, onward from of old. It grows there, the breath of human passion rustling through it, or storm-tost, the storm-wind howling through it, like the voice of all the gods. It is Igdrasil, the tree of existence. It is the past, the present, and the future. What was done; what is doing; what will be done. The infinite conjugation of the verb 'to do.'" There, now; given such an inspiring and suggestive passage, given also a good measure of poetic feeling, and a command of varied expression, and who could not write a poem, a poem that the world would be willing to read?

We are no poets, have no acquaintance whatever with the mysteries of poesy, and may therefore be uttering a heresy, for which the fraternity of Metre and Rhythm would burn us if they only knew us, when we say, that, according to our untutored judgment, there is *poetry* in "Igdrasil," yea, more, that "Igdrasil" is a poem; a poem that the world will willingly read. At all events, it weaves into mystic movement many things that we suppose to belong to a genuine poem—emotion, action, descriptive touches, flexibleness and harmony of language, and a commanding purpose, in this volume a high moral purpose, that gives unity to the whole.

LATIN PRONUNCIATION.†—Prof. Richardson, the author of this pamphlet, has earned to himself a high reputation as a profound Latin scholar, and an able teacher. There are other Latin professors in our colleges who, through their works, have made themselves more widely known to the public, but we know of few, if any, whose judgment we should more highly prize on a question of Latin philology. In the present little work, the author attacks the system of Latin pronunciation prevalent in this country and in England, and argues earnestly and ably for what he deems the true ancient pronunciation. On the abstract question all will, doubtless, concede that he makes out a very strong case, although many may hesitate

\* *Igdrasil; or, The Tree of Existence.* By James Challen, author of the *Cave of Macphelah*, and other poems. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.

† *Roman Orthoepe: a Plea for the Restoration of the Ancient System of Latin Pronunciation.* By John F. Richardson, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in the University of Rochester. New-York: Sheldon & Co., 115 Nassau street. 1859.



about the expediency of attempting a practical carrying out, in their full extent, of the doctrines of the book. Be that as it may, the discussion is learned and scholarly, and conducted in a manner which reflects high credit both on its author and the University in which he labors. We commend the work to the careful perusal of all who are interested in Latin philology.

CATHARINE.\*—We have read this charming book from beginning to end with unabated interest. It is a simple "In Memoriam" of a beloved daughter, who died the joyful death of a Christian at the early age of nineteen years. It is designed especially for the consolation of the bereaved, but is fitted to delight and profit every reflecting Christian. The author (generally understood to be Dr. Nehemiah Adams) has given us no biography of his daughter, but only an account of her pleasant death-bed, and of the feelings and reflections excited by it. He displays no morbid or exaggerated grief, makes no ostentatious parade of resignation, but simply and naturally relates the experience which every true Christian may feel under similar circumstances. Indeed, that which is personal in the book is written with such delicacy, such tenderness, such natural pathos, such simple confidence in the sympathy of the reader, that we seem rather to be perusing the letter of a near friend than the formal pages of a book. Though written in the most unpretending manner, it is yet marked by the elegance always characteristic of the author; and contains passages which lack only the rhythmical form to make them genuine poetry. It is rich in its suggestions to further reflection, and in its illumination of many Scripture passages pertaining to death, the resurrection, and the future life. In this age of fashionable restlessness and business haste, a book like this, full of repose and quiet thought, contemplating the scenes of a beautiful death-chamber with the rest and joy beyond, and written in a manner to attract those for whom commonly these topics have but little attraction, is an unqualified blessing, and more effective than a thousand pulpit homilies in disengaging the mind from its worldly engrossments, and in exciting aspirations for a higher and purer religious life.

## V.

ALLIBONE'S DICTIONARY OF AUTHORS.\*—This is a remarkable book. The patient and protracted industry requisite to its completion would dishearten most men, and appal the fitful worker, who depends on his impulses and moods. We were not among the hopeful ones when Mr. Allibone first issued his proposals, but are free to acknowledge ourselves as more than surprised and gratified by the fulfilment of his promises. The extent, and reliability, and value of the information he has amassed, make his book a repository which every man who has occasion to use books will feel he must possess. We miss the names of two or three unimportant New England authors, but our wonder is that these omissions should be so exceedingly rare, and that the details respecting the multitudes of those whose names are inserted should be so explicit and full.

\* *Catharine.* By the Author of "*Agnes and the Little Key.*" Third Thousand. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.

† *A Critical Dictionary of English Literature, and British and American Authors, living and deceased, from the earliest accounts to the middle of the Nineteenth Century; containing thirty thousand Biographies and Literary Notices, with forty indexes of subjects.* By S. Austin Allibone. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson.

HEADLEY'S LIFE OF HAVELock.\* It will be difficult for any one possessed of either martial spirit or Christian emotion to commence this volume and not read it to the end. There is much in it to kindle both martial and Christian ardor. A braver heart than Havelock's certainly never led a column of soldiers to a charge. A more beautiful Christian example than his was never set before the world. It seems, indeed, almost incredible that in the midst of camp and campaign duties, the most stern and trying, which were never neglected, and in the midst of dangers the most appalling, which were never shunned, two hours daily should have been given, by this Christian soldier, to the reading of the Scriptures, to prayer, and to religious meditation. It is marvellous that neither the trying duties of camp discipline, nor the terrors and tumults of actual warfare, ever interfered with his habits of private devotion. The example is one with which all Christians would do well to make themselves familiar.

In writing this work Mr. Headley has had at command very ample and reliable materials, including manuscript memoirs of his campaigns by Havelock. A great deal of conscientious labor has been expended on this life, and there is no reason to doubt that the author has given us a very authentic and trustworthy memoir.

The battle pieces are not, what some might expect, mere repetitions of those furnished in "Napoleon and his Marshals."

By some strange oversight the name of Dr. Marshman is uniformly written Marsham.

We commend this volume as one the reading of which, while it will not make the reader love war less, will be likely to make him love a pure Christian life more.

TRUTH IS EVERYTHING.†—This is an American reprint of one of Mrs. Geldart's excellent books for children. A more useful book cannot be put into the hands of young persons. The polite duplicity and graceful deceptions of society have so blunted our moral sensibilities that slight deviations from truth, are received with almost universal indulgence. Yet truthfulness must always lie at the foundation of whatever is beautiful and excellent; and a book which teaches that there can be no twilight blending of truth and falsehood, but that truth is truth, and what is not truth is a lie, cannot be too widely circulated and read.

FRANK ELLIOTT: OR WELLS IN THE DESERT.‡—This is an attempt to hang upon a very slight thread of fiction the distinctive views of those calling themselves Disciples, and popularly known as Campbellites. The dialogue is constrained and awkward, marring without concealing the didactic aim of the author. The book will hardly make many converts, but will doubtless strengthen those who are already of the author's way of believing. But perhaps we do not enough appreciate its merits, as we freely confess, that from the author's views of faith, as well as of the office of the Holy Spirit, and of the ordinance of baptism, we should totally dissent. Fiction has never seemed to us the best method of conveying sectarian views to the public.

---

\* *The Life of General H. Havelock, K. C. B.* By Prof. J. T. Headley, author of "Napoleon and his Marshals," &c. New-York: Charles Scribner, 1859.

† *Truth is Everything.* By Mrs. Thomas Geldart. New-York: Sheldon & Co., No. 115 Nassau street. 1859.

‡ *Frank Elliott: or Wells in the Desert.* By James Challen. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1859.